DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 506	HE 016 377
AUTHOR	Campbell, Joel T.; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation of a Program for Training Dentists in the Care of Handicapped Patients.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, New Brunswick, N.J.
REPORT NO	ETS-RR-82-52
PUB DATE	Dec 82
NOTE	323p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; *Clinical Experience; *Dental Schools; *Dentists; *Disabilities; Followup Studies; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; *Patients; *Program Evaluation; School Surveys; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A program for improving and expanding dental education concerning treatment of the handicapped was evaluated and compared to dental education programs that were not funded to address the needs of the handicapped. Eleven dental schools received funding during 1975-1978 from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for the special training. Various kinds of evaluative measures were employed, including measures of the appropriate technical knowledge for handicapped care, and attitudes about treatment of handicapped persons in actual practice. A second part of the evaluation effort was a followup survey of the graduates of the 11 target schools in the years 1974, 1976, and 1978 to determine the nature and extent of the handicapped patients in their practice. The data were supplemented by observations made during site visits to the schools. In addition, graduates of 10 schools that had not been funded were surveyed in 1978 and 1980. Extensive data are presented concerning results of a knowledge test, clinical experience with handicapped patients, treatment planning alternatives, student background characteristics, and followup results. Followup site visits to nine schools who were funded to provide the special training revealed that each of the schools were honoring their commitment to continue the program with their own resources. Questionnaires are included. (SW)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

RR-82-52

ED232506

RESEARCH REPORT

EVALUATION OF A PROGRAM FOR TRAINING DENTISTS IN THE CARE OF HANDICAPPED PATIENTS

Joel T. Campbell
Barbara F. Esser
Ronald L. Flaugher

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ETS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

December 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE016377

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

EVALUATION OF A PROGRAM FOR TRAINING DENTISTS IN THE CARE OF HANDICAPPED PATIENTS

Submitted to

THE ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON FOUNDATION

Joel T. Campbell

Barbara F. Esser

Ronald L. Flaugher

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

September 1982

Copyright © 1982. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY PAGE

Background i
Findings ii
Discussion iii

SECTION I: DATA GATHERED ON STUDENTS IN SCHOOL

Procedure 1
Knowledge Test 2
Clinical Experience with Handicapped Patients 8
Treatment Planning Alternatives 25
Background Characteristics 57
National Board Examinations 80
Discussion and Conclusions 84

SECTION II: FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES AFTER TWO YEARS IN PRACTICE

Procedure 85
Survey Results 86
Relationship Between Knowledge Test Scores and the Care of Handicapped Patients 98
Relationship Between Clinical Experience as Students and Practice Experience after Graduation 123
Conclusions 206

PAGE

TABLE 1 3
TABLE 2 4
TABLE 3 6
TABLE 4 10
TABLE 4.1..........11
TABLE 4.2..........12
TABLE 4.3..........14
TABLE 4.4..........15
TABLE 4.5..........16
TABLE 4.6..........17
TABLE 4.7..........19
TABLE 4.8..........20
TABLE 4.9..........22
TABLE 4.10.........23
TABLE 4.11.........24
TABLE 5 26
TABLE 6 28
TABLE 6.1 32

PAGE

TABLE 6.2.........35
TABLE 6.3.........38
TABLE 6.4.........41
TABLE 6.5.........45
TABLE 6.6.........48
TABLE 6.7.........51
TABLE 6.8.........54
TABLE 6.9.........58
TABLE 6.10........61
TABLE 6.11........64
TABLE 7 67
TABLE 7.1.........70
TABLE 7.2.........71
TABLE 7.3.........72
TABLE 7.4.........73
TABLE 7.5.........75
TABLE 7.6.........76
TABLE 7.7.........77

TABLE 7.8........ 78
TABLE 7.9........ 79
TABLE 7.10....... 81
TABLE 7.11....... 82
TABLE 8 83
TABLE 9 88
TABLE 10......... 93
TABLE 11......... 95
TABLE 12......... 96
TABLE 13......... 97
TABLE 14......... 99
TABLE 15.........107
TABLE 16.........115
TABLE 17.........124
TABLE 18.........161
TABLE 19.........199
TABLE 20.........201
TABLE 21.........203

APPENDIX A .... 1 thru 13

APPENDIX B .... 14 thru 69

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this scope involves the efforts of many people. Particularly important for this project was the role of the advisory committee: Drs. Thomas Barber, Eric Bystrom, Devore Killup, Richard McKenzie, Edward Sweeney, and Kenneth Troutman. Mr. Francis Jones, then from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, was the project officer during the greater part of the project's existence, and made many important contributions. Dr. Catherine McCaslin, the project officer during the latter phase of the project, contributed to the interpretation of the data.

Norman Wexler and Dr. Lawrence Wightman handled the score equating for the knowledge test, and other data processing was contributed by Judy Pollack, Kirsten Yocum, and Norma Norris. Virginia Rau, as senior research assistant, took responsibility for many aspects of the project, particularly in data preparation.

Amanda Moore and Sonvetta Robinson were responsible for the physical preparation of this report. All of those named and others have the gratitude of the authors for their assistance in this effort.

SUMMARY

Background

In 1973 the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation announced a program for improving and expanding dental education concerning treatment of the handicapped. Selected dental schools would receive funding during the years 1974 to 1978. Of the forty dental schools submitting proposals, eleven were selected by a committee of the American Fund for Dental Health to receive the funding.

Educational Testing Service was asked to undertake an evaluation of the program, to determine its effectiveness in achieving the stated goals. Various kinds of evaluative measures were employed, including measures of the appropriate technical knowledge for handicapped care, and attitudinal reports about treatment of handicapped persons in actual practice. These measures were applied to dental students who graduated before the funding became effective, and then again to students in the years 1975 through 1978, while the program was in operation.

A second part of the evaluation effort was a follow-up survey of the graduates of the eleven target schools in the years 1974, 1976, and 1978, in each case two years after graduation, in order to determine the nature and extent of the handicapped patients in their practice.

Data from these sources were supplemented by observations made during site visits to the schools. In addition, graduates of ten schools which had not been funded were surveyed in 1978 and 1980.

Separate sections of this report detail results from the data gathered on students in school as well as that from the follow-up surveys. This section is intended to serve as an introduction, to summarize the conclusions, to add some information derived from the site visits, to voice caution about interpretation of the data, and finally, to offer suggestions that may prove useful to future programs of a similar nature.

Findings

1. The schools did provide increased instruction concerning handicapped care, both didactic and clinical, during the course of the programs, than had been provided to the students who graduated in 1974. They also provided more such instruction than did a group of schools which did not receive funding.
2. During the course of the program, the students reported increased confidence in their ability to treat handicapped patients with moderately complex dental problems.
3. There was a measurable increase in knowledge of dentistry for the handicapped during the course of the project.
4. The 1976 and 1978 graduates of funded schools reported seeing more types of handicapped patients in their practices than had the 1974 graduates. However, the 1976 and 1978 graduates of non-funded schools had practice profiles very similar to those from the funded schools.
5. There is some evidence that "hands on" experience is particularly important. Those students who reported that they had treated 2 or more patients with a particular handicap were somewhat more likely to report in their later practice office treatment of patients with that handicap.
6. Site visits in 1979 to the 9 schools whose funded programs were concluded in 1978 showed that each of the schools were honoring their commitment to continue the program with their own resources. In several schools the auxiliary staff had been reduced somewhat, but the essentials of the program were continued.

7. Measured knowledge of dental treatment of the handicapped showed little relationship to actual decisions--such as amount and extent--in the dentists' practice after graduation.

Discussion

There are several points that should be kept in mind both in reviewing the findings from this study, and in considering future programs of this type.

Each of the dental schools were required to include in its proposal to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation an agreement to cooperate with an evaluation study. The evaluation, however, was not designed until after the schools' proposals had been submitted. Several of the schools could not impose requirements on the students which had not been included in their catalog at the time they enrolled. Thus, the students could only be asked to participate, not required. If this had been foreseen, it might have been possible to require that proposals include a pledge of cooperation by current students. In any event, it is desirable that evaluation plans for future projects be developed before proposals are solicited from the schools.

In evaluating the data from this project, particularly comparisons between funded and non-funded schools, there should be explicit recognition that the project had an impact on unfunded as well as funded schools. The more than 40 schools which submitted proposals had to make an extensive review of their activities in the area, as well as consider what changes they would like to make. This review process in itself quite possibly caused some substantive changes, even though no foundation funds were provided.

Further, the project had high visibility throughout its existence and undoubtedly affected other schools through informal exchange of information.

Thus, while fiscal constraints undoubtedly kept the non-funded schools from doing as much as the funded schools, the existence of the program very likely created some beneficial changes beyond the eleven locations.

During the 1979 site visits, several project directors voiced the opinion that four years was too short a period for a program to become established in a school. They felt it would have been better to have the same total amount of funds distributed over a five year period.

There were in fact some schools which experienced some difficulty in getting the program under way during the first year. This was due to loss of key faculty in some instances, and inadequate time allotted for planning in others. A longer lead time between the decision to award funding and the initiation of the program might be helpful in these latter instances.

Despite the cautions and reservations, however, the data support the conclusion that overall the program accomplished the goal of increasing the availability of dental care for handicapped individuals. Further, it is the case that in any such funding effort there are more subtle or very long range effects that cannot be documented than there are effects which can. Judging from those that were documentable, there appear to have been many such additional effects as well.

SECTION I: DATA GATHERED ON STUDENTS IN SCHOOL

Procedure

Plans for evaluation of the Robert Wood Johnson program for training dentists in the care of the handicapped called for gathering data on students in the schools shortly before graduation and on graduates two years after graduation. This section covers data gathered on students before graduation.

Three different measures for obtaining information from students about to graduate were developed and printed in a single booklet. These included:

(1) A test of knowledge of dentistry for the handicapped.

(2) An inquiry about clinical experience with a variety of handicapping conditions.

(3) An inquiry on expressed confidence in treating a number of combinations of dental problems and handicapping conditions.

Several background questions were also included. A new form of the knowledge test was developed each year from 1974 through 1978, following the same test content outline and including sufficient items from the previous year's form so that scores could be meaningfully equated. The schools included in the program were asked to administer the three instruments to graduating seniors at a convenient time during the spring of each year. In order to secure solid base-line information, data were gathered on the class graduating in 1974, before funding for the project became effective, and on the classes graduating in 1975 through 1978, the years when the schools received financial support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

The schools had agreed to cooperate in an evaluation, but this agreement was made before the specific evaluation plan was developed. Some schools felt that they could not require or pressure students to participate. Participation rates varied widely from school to school, particularly for 1974, as will be seen in the next section.

Knowledge Test

Table 1 shows, by year and by school, means and standard deviations for the knowledge test scores, together with the number of cases and the approximate percentage of graduating students who participated. Although a different form of the test was given each year, the scores were equated statistically so that year to year comparisons may be made. It is clear from this table that at some schools in some years the participation rate was very low. This complicates interpretation of the data. However, it is possible to draw some meaningful inferences. For all participating students the 1978 mean test score, 102.7, was significantly higher than either the 1974 mean, 100.0, or the 1975 mean, 99.6, well beyond the .001 level of significance. The differences are not large, amounting to correct responses to about three test items, but they are beyond the chance level.

For individual schools, comparisons were made between mean scores for 1978 and those for either 1974 or 1975, whichever had the better participation percentage. Of the nine schools for which this comparison was possible, three results did not reach the .05 significance level, two were significant at the .05 level, and four were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. (Schools are referred to throughout this report by number in order to maintain anonymity.)

For Schools 01, 07, 08, 09, and 10 1974 appeared to be the most appropriate base year. The gains were significant beyond the .001 level for Schools 01 and 09, significant at the .05 level for School 10, and not significant for Schools

TABLE 1

Knowledge Test Score Means and Standard Deviations by Schools and Approximate Percent of Students Participating

School	1974				1975				1976				1977				1978			
	M	SD	N	%	M	SD	N	%	M	SD	N	%	M	SD	N	%	M	SD	N	%
01	96.9	8.7	53	95	104.6	8.0	64	96	106.7	5.9	69	99	102.0	7.1	65	93	105.4	7.7	62	100
02	104.1	8.8	62	66	104.3	7.9	86	75	105.5	7.6	98	94	106.7	8.7	93	99	106.5	6.7	84	82
03	97.9	7.7	35	64	96.7	8.0	37	69												
04	107.1	7.5	23	18	97.9	8.7	106	89	99.1	7.1	112	96	99.3	7.2	113	96	101.4	7.3	122	90
05	103.8	9.8	89	72	103.4	8.3	125	89	101.7	8.7	118	87	102.2	7.2	98	65	105.4	6.8	114	76
06	100.4	8.4	73	59	97.2	8.8	113	93	99.9	7.5	130	87	103.8	5.6	84	56				
07	97.3	8.4	54	93	93.1	12.4	47	81	91.8	10.9	53	84	94.3	5.8	38	59	99.3	6.6	41	63
08	100.5	10.2	34	81	99.4	11.4	31	72	101.8	6.6	39	98	104.5	8.3	45	90	104.2	6.1	38	76
09	94.0[1]	9.6	142	79					102.7	8.4	133	67	92.9	12.2	122	58	101.5	6.5	169	85
10	93.0	11.5	40	53	92.8[2]	8.3	32	43	97.2	9.5	70	88	97.1	8.2	74	87	98.1	8.4	75	88
					101.8[3]	7.8	30	93												
11	98.4	8.5	63	77	97.4	8.2	81	94	99.7	8.0	88	97	100.0	8.4	72	76	102.5	6.7	90	99
Total	100	10.0	668		99.6	9.4	722		100.9	9.6	910		100.1	9.4	804		102.7	7.4	795	

[1] 1975 graduates tested in Fall 1974

[2] Class graduating Spring 1975

[3] Class graduating Winter 1975

Table 2

Base year knowledge test mean compared with final year mean

Base year mean	Final year mean	Difference
N = 721	N = 795	
98.5	102.7	4.2

07 and 08. For Schools 02, 04, 05, and 11, 1975 appeared to be the appropriate base year. The gains were significant beyond the .001 level for Schools 04 and 11, significant at the .05 level for School 05, and not significant for School 02.

Perhaps more important than the significance tests is the fact that the mean gain scores between the base year and 1978 are positive in every instance. These gain scores are not random fluctuations. Table 2 compares the overall base year mean with the final year mean, with a mean gain of 4.2.

Table 3 shows the percentage of questions in the various areas of the knowledge test answered correctly for each participating school and year. In reviewing this table the reader should bear in mind that it differs in important ways from Table 1. Table 1 reports standard scores, which have been equated from year to year, so that a particular score has approximately the same meaning, regardless of the year concerned. It is not feasible to do year-to-year equating on small groups of items, such as we are involved with here, other than by an elaborate and expensive process involving prior experimental administration of large numbers of items, analysis of item characteristics, and selection for final use in each form of only those items with appropriate item characteristics. For the tests administered, the only control on item difficulty was the advisory committee′s judgment that the item was appropriate for students about to graduate from dental school. Accordingly, year to year differences in Table 3 will not be considered, but school-to-school differences for each year are quite meaningful.

The reader should also bear in mind that subscores are almost necessarily less stable than scores on the total test. However, while care must be taken to avoid overinterpreting small differences in the table, either from one

TABLE 3

Percentage of Questions Answered Correctly, 1975-78,
by Subject Area and by School

	Total	School 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11
(1) Mental retardation												
1975	58	72	66	60	84	60	48	51	45		46	62
1976	59	72	62		57	55	65	47	58	57	54	57
1977	52	55	59		50	56	63	48	55	42	47	47
1978	63	73	69		56	66		54	65	65	56	62
(2) Cerebral palsy												
1975	45	44	52	77	45	44	38	34	51		35	42
1976	40	44	50		36	37	42	31	41	42	34	34
1977	36	33	50		31	33	46	29	43	28	29	35
1978	41	51	46		37	43		38	40	40	33	41
(3) Miscellaneous motor problems												
1975	50	54	55	48	47	53	48	37	48		48	50
1976	54	58	60		50	52	58	39	54	56	48	55
1977	48	46	60		42	48	60	38	55	40	43	50
1978	40	44	48		36	42		34	45	37	36	45
(4) Other neuromuscular problems												
1975	58	61	64	54	58	63	56	50	59		48	53
1976	50	53	52		47	53	50	42	50	52	47	50
1977	50	51	58		51	49	56	43	70	39	46	54
1978	56	52	65		56	58		50	57	54	50	59
(5) Congenital and genetic anomalies												
1975	42	55	44	33	34	45	48	40	40		35	36
1976	43	62	52		40	39	35	27	43	50	36	43
1977	40	45	45		37	43	42	36	46	35	41	33
1978	45	57	44		45	52		44	46	40	38	45
(6) Metabolic-systemic problems												
1975	48	52	50	47	45	53	45	43	48		43	45
1976	53	58	57		53	55	50	47	57	53	50	49
1977	60	68	62		63	64	62	49	62	50	60	58
1978	54	53	57		55	59		50	58	53	49	51
(7) Psychological problems												
1975	48	49	53	42	49	53	46	32	50		41	50
1976	50	53	52		48	56	48	32	53	54	47	51
1977	49	51	59		47	52	48	41	57	41	40	59
1978	50	54	50		51	54		48	51	48	44	49
(8) Neoplasia												
1975	56	61	57	50	54	62	54	47	59		46	49
1976	42	46	51		43	46	29	35	42	45	36	41
1977	38	40	47		38	46	35	36	46	32	35	36
1978	46	50	53		43	50		40	49	46	43	40

school to another in the same year or for the same school from year to year, it is possible to observe areas where individual schools show a particular strength or a particular weakness.

School 01 can be seen to have somewhat higher scores than the total in the areas of mental retardation, congenital and genetic anomalies, metabolic-systemic problems, and neoplasia. In other areas it is generally in line with the total average.

School 02 is above the average for all of the areas. In one year, for congenital and genetic anomalies, it fell one percentage point below the total and was usually substantially above the total average.

School 03 was represented only in 1975. In that year it was substantially above the total average in one area, cerebral palsy, and substantially below the total average in one area, congenital and genetic anomalies.

School 04 had one unusually high score on the mental retardation area in 1975 and one somewhat low score in congenital and genetic anomalies the same year. Otherwise, its scores were about in line with the total.

School 05 was consistently above the total average in three areas, metabolic-systemic problems, psychological problems, and neoplasia and variously slightly above or slightly below the total average in the other areas.

School 06 was represented in 1975 through 1977. Its pattern was extremely variable, with departures from the total average as much as 12 percent above and as low as 13 percent below the total average.

School 07 was consistently below the total average in all areas in all years, the departures ranging from one percent to as much as 18 percent.

School 08 was usually on the plus side of the total group by a few percentage points. The major exception was in the area of mental retardation, where there were minus figures in three out of the four years.

School 09 was represented in 1976, 1977, and 1978. In 1977 all departures from the total group mean were on the minus side, by from 5 to 15 points. In the other two years the departures were small pluses or minuses. School 10 had one departure on the plus side, with the others ranging from zero to minus 10. School 11 had a number of small plus departures from the total average and a somewhat larger number of small minus departures.

It should be noted that Schools 07 and 11 originally structured their program primarily to change students' attitudes toward treating the handicapped, rather than emphasizing a didactic program, although both later put more emphasis on direct teaching of knowledge. It is perhaps worth repeating that on an equated score basis, all of the schools showed a rising total score pattern over the course of the program.

Clinical Experience with Handicapped Patients

From 1975 through 1978 one section of the booklet which was administered asked students to report their clinical experiences with each of a list of handicapping conditions. For each condition, the student was asked whether he or she had seen a presentation of such a case, assisted someone else in treating such a case, and treated one patient or two or more patients with such a condition. Table 4 shows the percentage of students at all schools who reported each year that they had treated one or more patients with each of a number of conditions. Year-to-year comparisons are complicated because not all schools participated in all four years and because participation varied from year to year in several schools. It can be seen, however, that whereas in 1975 slightly fewer than one-fourth of the participating students had treated at least one patient with mental retardation, in 1978 more than half had treated at least one.

It is clear from Table 4 that there was a considerable increase in student exposure to a wide variety of handicapping conditions over the years. Between 1975 and 1978, the proportion of students who had treated at least one handicapped patient increased for 34 of 37 handicapping conditions and remained the same or decreased for only three. About 17 percent had treated one or more cases of cerebral palsy in 1975, while 30 percent had done so in 1978. In 1975 only three percent had treated a patient with multiple sclerosis, while 12 percent had done so in 1978.

There was not, of course, an even rate of increase year to year for all handicapping conditions, but it is quite clear that by the end of the grant period more students were seeing patients with handicapping conditions than did the students at the beginning of the grant period.

Similar patterns can be seen in the tables for most of the individual schools. At School 01, shown in Table 4-1, the percentage of students who had treated one or more cases of mental retardation increased from just under 30 to over 50, while those who had treated at least one cerebral palsy case increased from 5 to nearly 40 percent. There were increases for 36 of the 37 handicapping conditions.

At School 02, there were increases in student exposure to only 24 out of the 37 handicapping conditions, as can be seen in Table 4-2. The areas of mental retardation and cerebral palsy, which had very substantial increases in student involvement in most schools, actually had a decrease here. This phenomenon can be accounted for in terms of the school's efforts to change its handicapped program from a largely pediatric focus to one encompassing a range of adult problems.

TABLE 4

The Percentage of Graduates of All Schools Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 791	1976 N = 910	1977 N = 690	1978 N = 796
Mental retardation	24.0	34.4	34.6	52.1
Cerebral palsy	16.7	24.5	22.2	30.1
Blindness	4.5	9.3	10.1	16.2
Deafness	10.6	12.9	12.7	20.6
Epilepsy	24.6	27.2	26.2	42.2
Stroke	12.0	12.9	12.9	21.5
Parkinsonism	4.8	6.7	6.7	9.2
Arthritis	29.5	27.5	33.5	46.0
Poliomyelitis	3.0	4.6	3.5	6.9
Spinal cord injuries	5.4	7.6	10.4	12.6
Multiple sclerosis	3.0	6.7	6.8	12.4
Muscular dystrophy	3.0	8.6	5.2	10.5
Facial trauma from accidents	12.6	14.0	14.1	18.6
Multiply handicapped	11.1	17.4	18.8	27.1
The homebound patient	6.8	4.2	5.1	8.0
The nursing-home patient	8.5	9.9	10.4	15.1
Cleft palate or lip	8.3	9.9	9.9	12.9
Other craniofacial anomalies	3.0	4.9	5.1	6.8
Spina bifida	1.3	3.0	1.9	2.0
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	0.8	0.3	0.4	1.4
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	42.7	38.7	46.2	63.1
Hemophilia	5.3	4.8	6.7	7.3
Cardiopulmonary disease	33.4	31.5	37.1	53.5
Asthma	33.2	31.4	31.3	41.3
Atherosclerosis	16.7	17.4	18.7	27.4
Emphysema	11.1	10.1	13.0	17.2
Cystic fibrosis	0.9	1.4	1.7	4.4
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	36.8	31.0	34.2	45.3
Autism	1.1	2.5	2.2	4.9
Hyperactivity	23.0	21.3	19.1	23.0
Other behavior problems	26.5	22.0	22.9	30.9
Leukemia	1.8	2.1	1.4	3.8
Other blood dyscrasias	7.1	6.6	5.5	5.8
Brain tumors	2.5	2.2	1.7	3.9
Sarcomas	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.9
Squamous cell carcinoma	4.4	4.9	3.0	5.3
Other neoplasms	5.4	6.1	6.5	9.5

TABLE 4-1

The Percentage of School One Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 64	1976 N = 69	1977 N = 65	1978 N = 62
Mental retardation	29.7	39.1	56.9	53.2
Cerebral palsy	4.7	17.4	36.9	38.7
Blindness	4.7	5.8	23.1	30.6
Deafness	3.1	13.0	23.1	21.0
Epilepsy	21.9	33.3	47.7	54.8
Stroke	10.9	21.7	23.1	25.8
Parkinsonism	3.1	5.8	6.2	12.9
Arthritis	28.1	33.3	33.8	53.2
Poliomyelitis	-	7.2	6.2	16.1
Spinal cord injuries	4.7	23.2	27.7	19.4
Multiple sclerosis	-	1.4	6.2	9.7
Muscular dystrophy	-	2.9	7.7	21.0
Facial trauma from accidents	4.7	17.4	20.0	32.3
Multiply handicapped	7.8	23.2	36.9	30.6
The homebound patient	25.0	1.4	6.2	16.1
The nursing-home patient	15.6	10.1	13.8	24.2
Cleft palate or lip	9.4	15.9	23.1	38.7
Other craniofacial anomalies	4.7	7.2	6.2	16.1
Spina bifida	3.1	10.1	1.5	6.4
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	-	-	3.2
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	57.8	53.6	66.1	77.4
Hemophilia	-	5.8	10.8	19.3
Cardiopulmonary disease	26.6	43.5	55.4	67.7
Asthma	31.2	43.5	43.1	62.9
Atherosclerosis	35.9	18.8	32.3	45.2
Emphysema	14.1	18.8	23.1	40.3
Cystic fibrosis	-	-	1.5	9.7
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	32.8	43.5	47.7	50.0
Autism	1.6	2.9	-	3.2
Hyperactivity	14.1	30.4	29.2	27.4
Other behavior problems	43.7	29.0	40.0	29.0
Leukemia	1.6	4.3	1.5	8.1
Other blood dyscrasias	6.3	5.8	9.2	9.7
Brain tumors	1.6	7.2	3.1	12.9
Sarcomas	-	1.4	-	4.8
Squamous cell carcinoma	1.6	5.8	1.5	8.1
Other neoplasms	3.1	10.1	7.7	21.0

TABLE 4-2

The Percentage of School Two Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 86	1976 N = 98	1977 N = 93	1978 N = 84
Mental retardation	19.8	27.5	24.7	14.3
Cerebral palsy	20.9	25.5	12.9	13.1
Blindness	1.2	4.1	4.3	14.3
Deafness	3.5	6.1	7.5	19.0
Epilepsy	18.6	16.3	24.7	30.9
Stroke	7.0	9.2	12.9	21.4
Parkinsonism	4.6	2.0	2.1	4.8
Arthritis	27.9	27.5	38.7	55.9
Poliomyelitis	-	1.0	2.1	2.4
Spinal cord injuries	2.3	4.1	8.6	8.3
Multiple sclerosis	3.5	4.1	9.7	8.3
Muscular dystrophy	1.2	12.2	6.4	9.5
Facial trauma from accidents	16.3	22.4	14.0	15.5
Multiply handicapped	7.0	11.2	14.0	11.9
The homebound patient	5.8	3.1	5.4	5.9
The nursing-home patient	9.3	4.1	4.3	3.6
Cleft palate or lip	3.5	2.0	4.3	8.3
Other craniofacial anomalies	2.3	3.1	1.1	1.2
Spina bifida	1.2	-	1.1	-
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	-	1.1	1.2
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	34.9	35.7	51.6	58.3
Hemophilia	4.7	4.1	2.1	3.6
Cardiopulmonary disease	36.0	38.8	44.1	48.8
Asthma	34.9	28.6	32.3	34.5
Atherosclerosis	16.3	16.3	12.9	20.2
Emphysema	8.1	8.2	11.8	14.3
Cystic fibrosis	-	-	1.1	1.2
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	29.1	31.6	44.1	41.7
Autism	1.2	2.0	1.1	1.2
Hyperactivity	11.6	24.5	17.2	13.1
Other behavior problems	24.4	17.3	23.6	23.8
Leukemia	2.3	1.0	-	1.2
Other blood dyscrasias	7.0	4.1	6.5	5.9
Brain tumors	2.3	-	-	2.4
Sarcomas	2.3	3.1	-	2.4
Squamous cell carcinoma	7.0	5.1	5.4	8.3
Other neoplasms	8.1	6.1	9.7	5.9

School 03, shown in Table 4-3, was represented only in 1975 and thus no trends can be observed. School 04, shown in Table 4-4, was represented in 1975, 1976, and 1978. Between 1975 and 1978, there were increases in student experience for 25 out of 37 handicapping conditions. The area of mental retardation, which in 1975 was at a very high rate of 58 percent, advanced to almost 79 percent.

Data for School 05 are shown in Table 4-5. Between 1975 and 1978 there was an increase in the percentage of students reporting having treated at least one patient for 34 out of the 37 handicapping conditions. For one condition, squamous cell carcinoma, there was a small decrease. For thalidomide-induced deformities there was no treatment reported in any year, and for sarcomas, there was no treatment reported by those who graduated in 1975 and 1978, although small percentages of 1976 and 1977 graduates reported treating such patients.

Data are available for School 06 for 1975, 1976, and 1977 only and are shown in Table 4-6. The response pattern is drastically different from that of other schools. For example, in 1975 only 6.2 percent of the students reported having treated a patient with mental retardation. More did so in 1976 and 1.2 percent did so in 1977. In 1975, 3.5 percent of the students reported having treated a patient with cerebral palsy, while more did so in 1976 and 1977. Forty-six percent of 1975 graduates reported having treated a patient with allergic reactions to drugs, compared to 7.7 percent in 1976 and 19.0 percent in 1977. Unfortunately, it appears that many of the students were not responding seriously, at least in 1976 and 1977. Funding for this school was terminated in 1977.

TABLE 4-3

The Percentage of School Three Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 37	1976* N =	1977* N =	1978* N =
Mental retardation	5.4			
Cerebral palsy	-			
Blindness	5.4			
Deafness	-			
Epilepsy	16.2			
Stroke	5.4			
Parkinsonism	-			
Arthritis	21.6			
Poliomyelitis	5.4			
Spinal cord injuries	-			
Multiple sclerosis	-			
Muscular dystrophy	-			
Facial trauma from accidents	5.4			
Multiply handicapped	-			
The homebound patient	2.7			
The nursing-home patient	-			
Cleft palate or lip	10.8			
Other craniofacial anomalies	5.4			
Spina bifida	-			
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-			
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	21.6			
Hemophilia	5.4			
Cardiopulmonary disease	16.2			
Asthma	27.0			
Atherosclerosis	5.4			
Emphysema	5.4			
Cystic fibrosis	-			
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	24.3			
Autism	-			
Hyperactivity	8.1			
Other behavior problems	2.7			
Leukemia	-			
Other blood dyscrasias	-			
Brain tumors	2.7			
Sarcomas	2.7			
Squamous cell carcinoma	2.7			
Other neoplasms	2.7			

* Data not available for this year.

TABLE 4-4

The Percentage of School Four Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 106	1976 N = 112	1977* N =	1978 N = 122
Mental retardation	57.5	64.3		78.7
Cerebral palsy	54.7	51.8		45.9
Blindness	3.8	8.9		18.0
Deafness	17.0	15.2		26.2
Epilepsy	58.5	60.7		70.5
Stroke	17.9	17.0		21.3
Parkinsonism	6.6	6.2		9.0
Arthritis	34.9	24.1		39.3
Poliomyelitis	1.9	7.1		6.6
Spinal cord injuries	6.6	10.7		22.9
Multiple sclerosis	8.5	12.5		18.8
Muscular dystrophy	15.1	17.0		18.8
Facial trauma from accidents	16.0	17.0		27.0
Multiply handicapped	34.0	31.2		41.8
The homebound patient	16.0	10.7		9.0
The nursing-home patient	12.3	13.4		16.4
Cleft palate or lip	15.1	13.4		9.8
Other craniofacial anomalies	4.7	5.4		6.6
Spina bifida	0.9	4.5		0.8
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	1.8		0.8
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	59.4	47.3		66.4
Hemophilia	7.5	5.3		0.8
Cardiopulmonary disease	49.0	42.9		55.7
Asthma	54.7	47.3		45.1
Atherosclerosis	17.0	30.3		31.1
Emphysema	13.2	13.4		12.3
Cystic fibrosis	0.9	3.6		8.2
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	50.0	41.1		50.8
Autism	2.8	7.1		10.7
Hyperactivity	49.1	42.0		37.7
Other behavior problems	42.4	48.2		37.7
Leukemia	2.8	3.6		3.3
Other blood dyscrasias	12.3	11.6		7.4
Brain tumors	6.6	4.5		0.8
Sarcomas	0.9	5.4		2.5
Squamous cell carcinoma	6.6	6.2		5.7
Other neoplasms	6.6	8.9		11.5

*Data not available for this year.

TABLE 4-5

The Percentage of School Five Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 125	1976 N = 118	1977 N = 98	1978 N = 115
Mental retardation	19.2	41.5	56.1	75.7
Cerebral palsy	5.6	22.9	31.6	30.4
Blindness	4.0	6.8	10.2	9.6
Deafness	8.0	13.6	14.3	20.9
Epilepsy	14.4	27.1	22.4	41.7
Stroke	8.0	5.1	8.2	10.4
Parkinsonism	3.2	2.5	4.1	7.0
Arthritis	26.4	28.8	34.7	36.5
Poliomyelitis	1.6	3.4	2.0	7.0
Spinal cord injuries	4.0	7.6	7.1	10.4
Multiple sclerosis	1.6	2.5	4.1	16.5
Muscular dystrophy	-	5.9	3.1	5.2
Facial trauma from accidents	9.6	13.6	14.3	15.6
Multiply handicapped	4.0	16.1	17.3	25.2
The homebound patient	0.8	-	2.0	5.2
The nursing-home patient	4.0	9.3	6.1	12.2
Cleft palate or lip	8.8	11.9	9.2	13.9
Other craniofacial anomalies	4.0	4.2	5.1	4.3
Spina bifida	0.8	4.2	3.1	1.7
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	-	-	-
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	32.0	44.9	44.9	64.3
Hemophilia	2.4	5.9	3.1	6.1
Cardiopulmonary disease	25.6	20.3	29.6	43.5
Asthma	34.4	31.4	39.8	46.1
Atherosclerosis	17.6	13.6	20.4	26.9
Emphysema	13.6	14.4	10.2	16.5
Cystic fibrosis	0.8	0.8	1.0	2.6
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	27.2	33.0	23.5	47.0
Autism	1.6	-	2.0	6.1
Hyperactivity	20.0	13.6	31.6	23.5
Other behavior problems	30.4	21.2	26.5	35.6
Leukemia	0.8	2.5	2.0	7.0
Other blood dyscrasias	8.0	4.2	4.1	9.6
Brain tumors	0.8	-	-	1.7
Sarcomas	-	0.8	3.1	-
Squamous cell carcinoma	2.4	3.4	1.0	1.7
Other neoplasms	2.4	4.2	4.1	7.8

TABLE 4-6

The Percentage of School Six Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975	1976	1977	1978*
	N = 113	N = 130	N = 84	N =
Mental retardation	6.2	-	1.2	
Cerebral palsy	3.5	-	-	
Blindness	2.6	-	-	
Deafness	8.8	0.8	4.8	
Epilepsy	16.8	-	2.4	
Stroke	7.1	-	-	
Parkinsonism	4.4	-	-	
Arthritis	18.6	3.1	9.5	
Poliomyelitis	1.8	-	-	
Spinal cord injuries	3.5	-	-	
Multiple sclerosis	0.9	-	-	
Muscular dystrophy	-	-	-	
Facial trauma from accidents	3.5	-	4.8	
Multiply handicapped	2.6	0.8	-	
The homebound patient	1.8	-	-	
The nursing-home patient	2.6	-	1.2	
Cleft palate or lip	2.6	-	1.2	
Other craniofacial anomalies	-	-	-	
Spina bifida	0.9	-	-	
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	-	-	
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	38.0	3.8	14.3	
Hemophilia	0.9	-	-	
Cardiopulmonary disease	36.3	3.8	10.7	
Asthma	16.8	3.8	10.7	
Atherosclerosis	9.7	0.8	2.4	
Emphysema	7.1	0.8	2.4	
Cystic fibrosis	-	-	-	
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	46.0	7.7	19.0	
Autism	-	-	-	
Hyperactivity	16.8	3.1	2.4	
Other behavior problems	11.5	-	3.6	
Leukemia	-	-	-	
Other blood dyscrasias	6.2	0.8	2.4	
Brain tumors	0.9	-	-	
Sarcomas	1.8	-	-	
Squamous cell carcinoma	2.6	-	-	
Other neoplasms	4.4	0.8	-	

*Data not available for this year.

School 07 shows a more "normal" pattern, as seen in Table 4-7. There were increases in 34 of the 37 handicapping conditions treated between 1975 and 1978. In 1975 six percent (three students) reported having treated a patient with thalidomide-induced deformities, whereas five percent (two students) did so in 1978. There was also a decline from 17 percent to 15 per cent in students who had treated a patient with hyperactivity and from 12 percent to zero in those who had treated a patient with leukemia. In the opposite direction, those who had treated a patient with mental retardation increased from 15 percent to 76 percent. Cerebral palsy cases seen increased from 9 percent to 32 percent and multiple sclerosis cases seen increased from zero to 17 percent.

School 08 had a more variable pattern, probably because of its smaller number of students. These data are shown in Table 4-8. There were decreases for 21 of the 37 handicapping conditions treated between 1975 and 1978, but it should be noted that these decreases generally still left a substantial number of students who had had experience with those handicaps. The decreases probably occurred because the 1975 percentage was high, rather than because the 1978 percentage was low. For example, slightly more than a third of the 1975 graduates reported that they had treated a patient with epilepsy, while 26 percent reported that they had done so in 1978. Ten percent of 1975 graduates (three students) had treated a patient with spina bifida, while 5 percent (two students) of 1978 graduates had done so.

Sixteen areas did show gains in the number of patients seen. Examples of this are mental retardation, where 26 percent of 1975 graduates reported treating such a patient, compared with 47 percent in 1978, and cerebral palsy, where the comparable figures are 19 and 53 percent. Clearly School 08 gave its students quite extensive exposure to patients with handicapping conditions in each of the four years reported here.

TABLE 4-7

The Percentage of School Seven Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 47	1976 N = 53	1977 N = 38	1978 N = 41
Mental retardation	14.9	24.5	63.2	75.6
Cerebral palsy	8.5	26.4	39.5	31.7
Blindness	-	17.0	7.9	17.1
Deafness	10.6	13.2	18.4	24.4
Epilepsy	2.1	20.7	23.7	39.0
Stroke	2.1	5.7	5.3	9.8
Parkinsonism	2.1	5.7	5.3	7.3
Arthritis	17.0	18.9	42.1	53.7
Poliomyelitis	4.3	1.9	7.9	12.2
Spinal cord injuries	4.3	1.9	10.5	9.8
Multiple sclerosis	-	3.8	15.8	17.1
Muscular dystrophy	2.1	1.9	13.2	9.8
Facial trauma from accidents	2.1	3.8	5.3	9.8
Multiply handicapped	4.3	17.0	42.1	39.0
The homebound patient	-	1.9	10.5	4.9
The nursing-home patient	4.3	5.7	10.5	14.6
Cleft palate or lip	-	1.9	5.3	7.3
Other craniofacial anomalies	-	-	7.9	7.3
Spina bifida	2.1	3.8	-	2.4
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	6.4	-	-	4.9
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	34.0	28.3	34.2	48.8
Hemophilia	8.5	-	-	9.8
Cardiopulmonary disease	17.0	20.8	18.4	41.5
Asthma	19.1	22.6	36.8	43.9
Atherosclerosis	12.8	9.4	7.9	22.0
Emphysema	4.3	3.8	18.4	24.4
Cystic fibrosis	2.1	1.9	13.2	12.2
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	34.0	30.2	36.8	48.8
Autism	-	3.8	-	4.9
Hyperactivity	17.0	20.7	15.8	14.6
Other behavior problems	21.3	13.2	26.3	29.3
Leukemia	2.1	-	-	-
Other blood dyscrasias	-	1.9	-	7.3
Brain tumors	-	-	5.3	7.3
Sarcomas	-	1.9	2.6	2.4
Squamous cell carcinoma	2.1	1.9	-	4.9
Other neoplasms	10.6	1.9	5.3	17.1

TABLE 4-8

The Percentage of School Eight Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 31	1976 N = 39	1977 N = 45	1978 N = 38
Mental retardation	25.8	51.3	37.8	47.4
Cerebral palsy	19.4	59.0	44.4	52.6
Blindness	3.2	10.3	28.9	26.3
Deafness	3.2	5.1	8.9	2.6
Epilepsy	35.5	33.3	40.0	26.3
Stroke	19.4	17.9	22.2	21.0
Parkinsonism	6.5	28.2	24.4	21.0
Arthritis	41.9	53.8	51.1	31.6
Poliomyelitis	6.5	5.1	4.4	7.9
Spinal cord injuries	19.4	12.8	13.3	7.9
Multiple sclerosis	6.5	5.1	17.8	21.0
Muscular dystrophy	9.7	12.8	11.1	7.9
Facial trauma from accidents	25.8	23.1	26.7	18.4
Multiply handicapped	32.3	41.0	37.8	36.8
The homebound patient	16.1	7.7	8.9	7.9
The nursing-home patient	9.7	10.3	20.0	15.8
Cleft palate or lip	32.3	23.1	13.3	10.5
Other craniofacial anomalies	9.7	20.5	20.0	10.5
Spina bifida	9.7	-	6.7	5.3
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	3.2	-	2.2	2.6
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	45.2	64.1	55.5	36.8
Hemophilia	29.0	20.5	31.1	26.3
Cardiopulmonary disease	35.5	56.4	48.9	44.7
Asthma	51.6	46.2	28.9	28.9
Atherosclerosis	16.1	28.2	31.1	23.7
Emphysema	12.9	7.7	13.3	10.5
Cystic fibrosis	6.5	7.7	6.7	18.4
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	35.5	35.9	44.4	26.3
Autism	-	2.6	4.4	5.3
Hyperactivity	32.3	25.6	17.8	21.0
Other behavior problems	45.2	20.5	26.7	15.8
Leukemia	6.5	5.1	11.1	5.3
Other blood dyscrasias	16.1	25.6	17.8	5.3
Brain tumors	16.1	2.6	6.7	7.9
Sarcomas	9.7	10.2	6.7	7.9
Squamous cell carcinoma	9.7	10.2	2.2	10.5
Other neoplasms	9.7	17.9	6.7	7.9

Data are available for School 09 for 1976, 1977, and 1978, as shown in Table 4-9. Between 1976 and 1978, there were increases in number of patients seen for 20 of the 37 handicapping conditions, despite the fact that School 09 reported quite substantial figures in 1976. For example, 34 percent of 16 graduates reported treating patients with mental retardation in 1976 and this figure increased to 40 percent in 1978. Seventeen percent of the 1976 graduates reported treating multiply handicapped patients, and this increased to almost 30 percent in 1978.

Examples of areas showing decreases in patients treated include Parkinsonism, with 15 percent in 1976 compared to 13 percent in 1978, and muscular dystrophy, which went from 16 to 14 percent. School 09 appears to have provided its students with considerable exposure to a wide range of handicapping conditions.

School 10, as shown in Table 4-10, had increases in student experience with patients for 25 of the 37 areas and decreases for 11. In the remaining area, thalidomide-induced deformities, there were no cases reported in any of the four years. Examples of increases include mental retardation, which went from 17 percent in 1975 to 29 percent in 1978; arthritis, with 35 percent in 1975 and 57 per cent in 1978; and allergic reactions to drugs with 32 percent in 1975 and 51 percent in 1978.

Examples of conditions which declined as to student experience are spinal cord injuries, with 9 percent in 1975 and 3 percent in 1978, and hyperactivity, which declined from 15 percent in 1975 to 11 percent in 1978. School 10 also provided substantial numbers of its students with experience in dealing with a wide variety of handicapping conditions.

School 11 had increases in student experience only in 23 out of 37 areas, despite quite substantial percentages among the 1975 figures, as seen in

TABLE 4-9

The Percentage of School Nine Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975*	1976	1977	1978
	N =	N = 133	N = 121	N = 169
Mental retardation		33.8	26.4	40.2
Cerebral palsy		27.8	20.7	28.4
Blindness		19.5	9.1	14.8
Deafness		27.8	10.7	23.1
Epilepsy		29.3	28.1	37.9
Stroke		21.8	16.5	26.6
Parkinsonism		15.0	16.5	13.0
Arthritis		31.6	31.4	46.2
Poliomyelitis		6.8	3.3	6.5
Spinal cord injuries		8.3	14.0	8.9
Multiple sclerosis		15.0	6.6	8.9
Muscular dystrophy		15.8	7.4	13.6
Facial trauma from accidents		6.8	10.7	9.5
Multiply handicapped		17.3	19.0	29.6
The homebound patient		10.5	9.1	13.0
The nursing-home patient		11.3	5.8	7.7
Cleft palate or lip		19.5	16.5	9.5
Other craniofacial anomalies		6.0	5.0	6.5
Spina bifida		2.2	4.1	0.6
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations		0.7	0.8	1.8
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances		48.1	51.2	72.2
Hemophilia		3.0	7.4	4.7
Cardiopulmonary disease		36.1	41.3	59.8
Asthma		29.3	30.6	37.3
Atherosclerosis		21.8	28.1	31.9
Emphysema		8.3	14.0	13.6
Cystic fibrosis		1.5	-	0.6
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment		33.8	33.9	46.1
Autism		3.8	5.8	3.5
Hyperactivity		21.8	17.4	18.9
Other behavior problems		27.1	24.0	34.3
Leukemia		2.2	0.8	3.0
Other blood dyscrasias		5.3	5.8	1.8
Brain tumors		5.3	2.5	4.1
Sarcomas		2.2	1.6	-
Squamous cell carcinoma		6.0	3.3	3.0
Other neoplasms		6.8	7.4	8.3

*Data not available for this year.

TABLE 4-10

The Percentage of School Ten Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 101	1976 N = 70	1977 N = 74	1978 N = 75
Mental retardation	16.8	32.9	25.7	29.3
Cerebral palsy	9.9	1.4	13.5	12.0
Blindness	4.0	5.7	13.5	5.3
Deafness	17.8	14.3	21.6	12.0
Epilepsy	21.8	21.4	24.3	22.7
Stroke	13.9	24.3	14.9	21.3
Parkinsonism	3.0	5.7	1.3	6.7
Arthritis	34.6	45.7	45.9	57.3
Poliomyelitis	5.9	4.3	2.7	6.7
Spinal cord injuries	8.9	4.3	1.3	2.7
Multiple sclerosis	1.0	-	1.3	1.3
Muscular dystrophy	-	4.3	-	1.3
Facial trauma from accidents	17.8	21.4	12.2	17.3
Multiply handicapped	5.9	8.6	13.5	8.0
The homebound patient	5.9	2.9	-	1.3
The nursing-home patient	5.9	12.9	12.2	4.0
Cleft palate or lip	5.9	7.1	5.4	5.3
Other craniofacial anomalies	2.0	4.3	5.4	6.7
Spina bifida	-	-	-	1.3
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	-	-	-	-
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	47.5	45.7	58.1	66.7
Hemophilia	3.0	4.3	5.4	8.0
Cardiopulmonary disease	32.7	37.1	48.6	52.0
Asthma	32.7	45.7	31.1	38.7
Atherosclerosis	16.8	21.4	17.6	18.7
Emphysema	10.9	12.9	13.5	20.0
Cystic fibrosis	-	-	1.3	1.3
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	31.7	38.6	36.5	50.7
Autism	-	1.4	-	1.3
Hyperactivity	14.8	14.3	16.2	10.7
Other behavior problems	17.8	14.3	16.2	13.3
Leukemia	1.0	-	-	2.7
Other blood dyscrasias	3.0	5.7	1.3	1.3
Brain tumors	-	-	-	2.7
Sarcomas	4.0	1.4	4.0	1.3
Squamous cell carcinoma	6.9	8.6	5.4	9.3
Other neoplasms	4.9	7.1	8.1	4.0

TABLE 4-11

The Percentage of School Eleven Students Who Treated One or More Patients with Specified Handicaps by Year of Graduation

Description of handicap	1975 N = 81	1976 N = 88	1977 N = 72	1978 N = 90
Mental retardation	34.6	42.0	43.1	53.3
Cerebral palsy	27.2	29.5	22.2	26.7
Blindness	16.0	18.2	5.6	21.1
Deafness	21.0	13.6	11.1	22.2
Epilepsy	32.1	35.2	33.3	38.9
Stroke	27.2	13.6	15.3	28.9
Parkinsonism	12.3	7.9	2.8	4.4
Arthritis	44.4	34.1	27.8	45.6
Poliomyelitis	7.4	10.2	6.9	3.3
Spinal cord injuries	6.2	9.1	15.3	18.9
Multiple sclerosis	7.4	17.0	9.7	14.4
Muscular dystrophy	3.7	9.1	4.2	3.3
Facial trauma from accidents	25.9	26.1	23.6	26.7
Multiply handicapped	18.5	25.0	13.9	23.3
The homebound patient	1.2	2.3	6.9	4.4
The nursing-home patient	21.0	25.0	31.9	44.4
Cleft palate or lip	8.6	8.0	9.7	18.9
Other craniofacial anomalies	2.5	7.9	4.2	7.8
Spina bifida	-	5.7	-	4.4
Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	2.5	-	-	1.1
Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	48.1	37.5	40.3	48.9
Hemophilia	9.9	9.1	9.7	7.8
Cardiopulmonary disease	40.7	39.8	36.1	56.7
Asthma	30.9	36.4	31.9	35.5
Atherosclerosis	17.3	20.4	13.9	20.0
Emphysema	17.3	14.8	16.7	15.6
Cystic fibrosis	2.5	2.3	-	1.1
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	46.9	27.3	31.9	36.7
Autism	2.5	2.3	4.2	5.5
Hyperactivity	38.3	25.0	23.6	31.1
Other behavior problems	27.2	26.1	25.0	38.9
Leukemia	3.7	3.4	1.4	3.3
Other blood dyscrasias	9.9	12.5	5.6	6.7
Brain tumors	2.5	2.3	2.8	3.3
Sarcomas	2.5	1.1	2.8	2.2
Squamous cell carcinoma	3.7	6.8	6.9	3.3
Other neoplasms	6.2	5.7	9.7	8.9

Table 4-11. Thus, 35 percent of 1975 graduates reported treating patients with mental retardation, compared to 53 percent in 1978, and 21 percent of 1975 graduates said they had treated nursing-home patients, while 44 percent of 1978 graduates had done so. Among areas showing declines were poliomyelitis, which went from 7 percent to 3 percent, and allergic reactions to drugs, which went from 47 percent to 37 percent.

The general picture which emerges from these data is that the schools differed considerably on how much clinical exposure to handicapping conditions they provided their students at the beginning of the funding period. They drew in different mixes of handicapped patients as the project progressed, but they did fulfill their obligation to provide this kind of experience. This confirms the observations made on site visits.

The overall pattern can be highlighted in Table 5, which shows, in percent, the students who treated two or more patients with selected handicapping conditions for the years 1975 through 1978. While the numbers are small, overall, there is a steady increase, the average doubling from three in 1975 to six percent in 1978. There is no doubt that clinical exposure to handicapping conditions increased between 1975 and 1978.

Treatment Planning Alternatives

One section of the test booklet, treatment planning alternatives, asked for judgments as to what disposition the student would make of patients with different combinations of a handicapping condition and a dental problem. Alternatives were (a) treat in the office; (b) treat after consultation with a specialist; (c) treat in a hospital; or (d) refer to a dental specialist. At the time this section was developed in early 1974, the advisory committee

Table 5

Percent of students who treated 2 or more patients with selected handicapping conditions 1975 through 1978

Handicap	1975	1976	1977	1978
	N = 791	910	690	796
Mental retardation	10	13	12	23
Cerebral palsy	5	5	6	7
Epilepsy	6	6	4	10
Stroke (including facial paralysis)	2	2	2	2
Spinal cord injuries	1	1	2	2
Multiple sclerosis	0	1	2	2
Muscular dystrophy	1	1	1	1
Multiply-handicapped	4	4	5	8
The Nursing-home patient	3	4	4	7
Cleft palate (and cleft lip)	2	2	3	2
Average	3	4	4	6

members chose the alternatives they thought most likely to be appropriate for a dentist newly out of dental school. These alternatives are marked with an asterisk in Table 6, which also shows the percentage of all students who chose each alternative in each year.

From 1974 through 1977, the proportion of students choosing "routine office treatment" as the alternative increased rather steadily. Across all 25 items, the average percentage choosing that alternative was 32.0 in 1974, 34.9 in 1975, 36.7 in 1976, and 38.3 in 1977. In 1978, however, the average percentage choosing that alternative dropped to 34.8. The reason for this decline may possibly be found in the number of cases involved in 1978, 796, compared with 690 cases in 1977. Nine schools were involved in each of the two years, although not the same nine. It appears that the project directors made somewhat more effort to obtain maximum participation in 1978 than in the previous year, and it may well have been that these additional students were those less concerned with the handicapped program or perhaps even adverse to it.

When the alternatives preferred by the advisory committee are considered, there is again a drop-off from 1977 to 1978, but not the rising trend from 1974 to 1977. (For ten items, "routine office treatment" was the preferred or one of two preferred alternatives; thus these categories are not completely independent of one another.) From 1974 to 1977, the average percentage remained about the same, the figures being 56.7 for 1974, 55.1 for 1975, 56.1 for 1976, and 56.5 for 1977. Then in 1978, it fell to 53.8.

It should be noted that the "preferred alternatives" were chosen by the advisory committee before the training program was underway, although after

TABLE 6

The Percentage of Total Students who chose each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 526	1975 N = 791	1976 N = 910	1977 N = 690	1978 N = 796
1. A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	14.1	20.3	24.9	27.2	14.8
	after consultation with specialist	20.0	24.7	25.2	23.9	22.1
	*only in a hospital**	24.3	17.4	19.2	16.5	24.9
	*refer to dental specialist**	40.3	33.9	28.5	30.6	34.2
2. An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	85.4	83.4	85.2	84.8	83.7
	after consultation with specialist	13.5	11.6	11.6	12.0	11.3
	only in a hospital		0.4	0.1	0.4	0.1
	refer to dental specialist	0.8	2.4	1.8	1.6	1.4
3. A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	42.8	50.1	53.2	58.8	51.0
	*after consultation with specialist**	33.3	25.8	26.6	22.9	25.5
	only in a hospital	1.7	1.5	2.2	1.3	3.0
	refer to dental specialist	21.5	19.1	16.6	15.4	16.8
4. An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	3.8	2.9	3.0	3.9	3.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	28.5	33.9	37.0	42.5	36.4
	only in a hospital	46.4	41.5	39.7	32.2	36.3
	refer to dental specialist	20.3	17.8	17.5	19.7	19.8
5. A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	59.3	70.3	77.2	76.5	69.6
	after consultation with specialist	32.1	20.9	16.5	16.1	22.4
	only in a hospital	2.3	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.0
	refer to dental specialist	5.5	4.5	3.5	4.2	2.9
6. A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	7.2	6.9	7.4	8.4	6.8
	after consultation with specialist	40.1	44.7	46.1	44.2	48.0
	*only in a hospital**	25.1	18.7	18.2	17.2	18.1
	*refer to dental specialist**	27.2	25.7	25.6	28.1	23.1
7. An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	16.5	16.9	13.8	16.8	14.2
	*after consultation with specialist**	62.7	59.7	60.8	58.7	57.5
	only in a hospital	10.1	11.5	12.0	8.8	12.3
	refer to dental specialist	9.9	8.6	10.9	12.7	11.4
8. A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	39.7	51.1	56.8	53.0	47.2
	after consultation with specialist	31.0	23.8	23.6	22.0	27.0
	only in a hospital	6.1	4.3	4.5	4.6	5.0
	refer to dental specialist	22.6	17.4	13.2	18.5	16.6

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	6.8	8.8	6.8	6.8	6.7
		after consultation with specialist	12.0	14.4	14.4	12.9	14.4
		only in a hospital	1.1	0.5	1.3	1.3	1.5
		*refer to dental specialist**	79.3	74.0	75.6	77.4	73.6
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	72.4	74.8	78.7	77.8	71.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	23.9	19.6	17.5	17.7	21.0
		only in a hospital	0.8	0.6	0.7	1.0	1.1
		refer to dental specialist	2.3	2.9	1.3	2.6	2.3
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	10.3	14.3	17.2	18.1	14.2
		after consultation with specialist	12.2	15.0	17.1	13.2	15.1
		only in a hospital	23.8	19.7	22.4	19.0	24.1
		*refer to dental specialist**	53.0	47.5	40.3	48.3	42.1
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	24.1	21.2	20.2	31.0	37.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	58.4	56.1	59.2	55.4	47.0
		only in a hospital	9.9	10.4	7.6	5.2	5.5
		refer to dental specialist	7.0	8.8	9.9	7.1	6.0
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	8.0	12.3	14.8	15.9	9.8
		after consultation with specialist	8.9	10.5	11.1	9.1	11.6
		*only in a hospital**	21.5	18.7	19.0	16.4	20.5
		*refer to dental specialist**	61.0	55.6	52.5	57.1	54.4
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	29.3	37.7	43.2	44.5	34.2
		after consultation with specialist	29.7	28.8	27.5	24.1	29.1
		only in a hospital	4.7	3.8	5.8	5.4	6.8
		refer to dental specialist	32.7	25.4	20.3	24.2	25.7
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	72.0	71.8	74.3	73.9	65.3
		after consultation with specialist	18.1	16.4	14.8	12.2	19.8
		only in a hospital	0.8	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.9
		refer to dental specialist	8.2	7.8	7.8	11.2	9.2
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	1.9	3.8	2.6	5.5	5.6
		after consultation with specialist	27.9	34.1	35.0	33.6	37.8
		*only in a hospital**	35.0	29.1	31.0	25.6	24.4
		*refer to dental specialist**	34.2	28.8	27.8	32.5	27.9
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	30.0	44.2	44.5	49.3	42.6
		after consultation with specialist	24.9	19.2	20.4	17.4	17.3
		*only in a hospital**	6.5	5.4	6.7	6.1	6.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	37.6	27.8	25.7	25.2	29.4

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	20.0	28.3	32.5	33.9	26.3
	after consultation with specialist	17.9	15.7	15.6	15.1	16.1
	*only in a hospital**	12.5	12.5	13.7	10.3	15.7
	*refer to dental specialist**	49.0	40.8	36.3	39.7	37.9
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	41.2	50.9	55.0	60.9	51.9
	after consultation with specialist	36.9	32.5	29.9	25.8	28.8
	only in a hospital	6.3	4.0	4.0	2.5	5.5
	refer to dental specialist	15.2	9.5	9.1	9.6	9.4
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	55.5	54.4	53.8	56.7	55.8
	after consultation with specialist	29.1	27.9	28.5	27.4	25.0
	only in a hospital	1.7	2.4	2.5	1.9	3.1
	*refer to dental specialist**	13.3	12.5	13.0	13.0	11.8
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	41.6	39.2	36.8	39.4	39.1
	*after consultation with specialist**	50.6	50.9	51.9	50.6	48.7
	only in a hospital	3.6	2.8	3.7	2.3	3.6
	refer to dental specialist	3.8	4.5	5.5	6.2	4.5
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	47.0	48.4	53.2	54.3	51.1
	after consultation with specialist	41.1	38.8	35.9	33.9	33.9
	only in a hospital	3.4	1.8	1.9	1.4	3.4
	refer to dental specialist	7.6	7.5	6.7	8.5	7.2
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	7.6	5.1	5.2	4.8	4.8
	*after consultation with specialist**	9.9	12.3	10.5	11.2	10.4
	only in a hospital	1.1	0.8	2.1	2.9	1.1
	refer to dental specialist	81.0	79.4	79.9	79.6	79.6
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	0.2	1.0	2.0	2.5	1.6
	after consultation with specialist	12.2	19.3	19.8	25.4	19.8
	*only in a hospital**	50.6	43.2	43.8	38.4	40.4
	refer to dental specialist	36.7	31.7	30.1	30.4	33.9
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	63.9	55.0	55.5	58.5	62.6
	*after consultation with specialist**	27.0	34.1	31.0	29.0	25.5
	only in a hospital	1.1	0.5	1.5	0.7	0.6
	refer to dental specialist	7.6	8.0	9.4	10.4	7.7

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

proposals had been reviewed and funding decisions made. It is possible that different alternatives might have been preferred by the advisory committee after consideration of the programs as they actually developed.

Tables 6-1 through 6-11 show the corresponding data on treatment planning alternative selection separately by schools. Since the number of cases is smaller, obviously, for each school than for the total, one can expect these figures to be affected more by random fluctuation.

For School 01, the average percentage choosing "routine office treatment" was 40.7 in 1974, 34.4 in 1975, 36.1 in 1976, 40.5 in 1977, and 35.4 in 1978. The average percentage choosing the preferred alternatives for the corresponding years was 58.9, 54.6, 57.7, 58.0, and 51.9. Any trend here, if there is one, is more than overcome by random fluctuation.

At School 02, the average percentage choosing "routine office treatment" was 25.0 in 1974, 40.3 in 1975, 40.5 in 1976, 41.5 in 1977, and 33.6 in 1978. Here we have a repetition of the phenomenom found for the total group, an increase through 1977 and then a drop-off in 1978. The corresponding figures for those choosing the preferred alternatives were 55.7, 52.1, 56.3, 57.5, and 55.3, with no trend apparent.

School 03 was represented only in 1974 and 1975. The average percentage choosing "routine office treatment" was 25.6 in 1974 and 24.5 in 1975. The average percentage choosing the preferred alternatives was 57.8 in 1974 and 51.4 in 1975.

School 04 was not represented in 1977 but was included in each of the other years. The average percentage choosing "routine office treatment" was 34.4 in 1974, 36.3 in 1975, 29.0 in 1976, and 29.7 in 1978. The corresponding

TABLE 6-1

The Percentage of School One Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
			N = 53	N = 64	N = 69	N = 65	N = 62
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	20.7	12.5	14.5	20.0	11.3
		after consultation with specialist	13.2	23.4	18.8	21.5	24.2
		*only in a hospital**	15.1	20.3	10.1	21.5	8.1
		*refer to dental specialist**	50.9	42.2	56.5	36.9	53.2
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	90.6	85.9	73.9	76.9	66.1
		after consultation with specialist	9.4	12.5	20.3	16.9	24.2
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	1.5	1.6
		refer to dental specialist	-	-	4.3	4.6	6.4
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	66.0	40.6	36.2	60.0	56.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	15.1	26.6	31.9	16.9	24.2
		only in a hospital	-	-	2.9	3.1	3.2
		refer to dental specialist	18.9	31.2	29.0	20.0	14.5
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	7.5	1.6	2.9	3.1	4.8
		*after consultation with specialist**	34.0	40.6	36.2	26.1	37.1
		only in a hospital	37.7	37.5	23.2	41.5	24.2
		refer to dental specialist	20.7	17.2	37.7	29.2	30.6
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	73.6	71.9	75.4	84.6	66.1
		after consultation with specialist	11.3	20.3	17.4	12.3	24.2
		only in a hospital	-	1.6	-	1.5	-
		refer to dental specialist	13.2	4.7	7.2	1.5	6.4
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	13.2	4.7	4.3	3.1	4.8
		after consultation with specialist	45.3	54.7	40.6	38.5	51.6
		*only in a hospital**	22.6	14.1	8.7	18.5	11.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	18.9	25.0	46.4	40.0	30.6
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	13.2	23.4	23.2	29.2	22.6
		*after consultation with specialist**	49.1	54.7	59.4	49.2	56.4
		only in a hospital	18.9	6.2	5.8	7.7	8.1
		refer to dental specialist	18.9	12.5	11.6	12.3	9.7
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	49.1	46.9	59.4	50.8	51.6
		after consultation with specialist	22.6	17.2	17.4	18.5	22.6
		only in a hospital	3.8	1.6	4.3	7.7	6.4
		refer to dental specialist	24.5	29.7	18.8	21.5	16.1

Note. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	3.8	20.3	8.7	13.8	14.5
		after consultation with specialist	7.5	17.2	26.1	9.2	19.3
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.4	-	1.6
		*refer to dental specialist**	88.7	60.9	63.8	76.9	62.9
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	86.8	78.1	82.6	83.1	69.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	11.3	17.2	13.0	13.8	22.6
		only in a hospital	-	1.6	-	1.5	3.2
		refer to dental specialist	1.9	1.6	4.3	1.5	1.6
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	20.7	10.9	13.0	10.8	14.5
		after consultation with specialist	7.5	12.5	8.7	6.1	14.5
		only in a hospital	11.3	28.1	7.2	33.8	12.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	60.4	46.9	71.0	49.2	51.6
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	26.4	17.2	24.6	32.3	41.9
		*after consultation with specialist**	58.5	65.6	58.0	46.1	43.5
		only in a hospital	9.4	3.1	2.9	7.7	3.2
		refer to dental specialist	5.7	12.5	13.0	13.8	9.7
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	11.3	9.4	13.0	4.6	8.1
		after consultation with specialist	9.4	10.9	7.2	6.1	19.3
		*only in a hospital**	5.7	17.2	8.7	21.5	11.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	73.6	60.9	69.6	67.7	59.7
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	41.5	34.4	47.8	53.8	33.9
		after consultation with specialist	28.3	28.1	27.5	21.5	17.7
		only in a hospital	1.9	6.2	1.4	3.1	9.7
		refer to dental specialist	26.4	29.7	23.2	21.5	37.1
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	79.2	65.6	82.6	78.5	69.3
		after consultation with specialist	13.2	25.0	10.1	9.2	19.3
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	1.6
		refer to dental specialist	7.5	7.8	7.2	12.3	8.1
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	5.7		5.8	6.1	4.8
		after consultation with specialist	35.8	35.9	36.2	29.2	41.9
		*only in a hospital**	30.2	23.4	10.1	27.7	14.5
		*refer to dental specialist**	28.3	37.5	46.4	36.9	35.5
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	52.8	40.6	46.4	58.5	50.0
		after consultation with specialist	9.4	23.4	15.9	15.4	11.3
		*only in a hospital**	1.9	1.6	1.4	6.1	6.4
		*refer to dental specialist**	35.8	29.7	36.2	20.0	29.0

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	34.0	17.2	21.7	23.1	27.4
	after consultation with specialist	3.8	9.4	5.8	4.6	21.0
	*only in a hospital**	1.9	15.6	8.7	15.4	8.1
	*refer to dental specialist**	60.4	54.7	63.8	56.9	41.9
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	50.9	45.3	52.2	72.3	50.0
	after consultation with specialist	22.6	35.9	31.9	18.5	32.3
	only in a hospital	1.9	1.6	5.8		3.2
	refer to dental specialist	24.5	14.1	10.1	9.2	12.9
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	77.4	56.2	43.5	61.5	51.6
	after consultation with specialist	9.4	28.1	30.4	16.9	19.3
	only in a hospital	1.9	-	-	1.5	8.1
	*refer to dental specialist**	11.3	12.5	26.1	20.0	17.7
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	41.5	57.8	52.2	47.7	43.5
	*after consultation with specialist**	45.3	35.9	37.7	38.5	45.2
	only in a hospital	5.7	-	2.9	6.1	3.2
	refer to dental specialist	7.5	3.1	7.2	7.7	6.4
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	58.5	45.3	46.4	56.9	41.9
	after consultation with specialist	26.4	39.1	40.6	32.3	35.5
	only in a hospital	3.8	-	1.4	3.1	6.4
	refer to dental specialist	11.3	12.5	10.1	6.1	12.9
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	5.7	7.8	7.2	3.1	11.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	7.5	18.7	18.8	6.1	17.7
	only in a hospital	3.8	-	-	3.1	3.2
	refer to dental specialist	83.0	70.3	72.5	87.7	66.1
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	1.6	2.9	3.1	6.4
	after consultation with specialist	13.2	12.5	18.8	15.4	21.0
	*only in a hospital**	54.7	37.5	30.4	33.8	24.2
	refer to dental specialist	32.1	40.6	44.9	46.1	45.2
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	86.8	65.6	62.3	75.4	62.9
	*after consultation with specialist**	9.4	26.6	11.6	12.3	17.7
	only in a hospital	1.9	-	-	1.5	1.6
	refer to dental specialist	1.9	4.7	24.6	10.8	16.1

* Alternatives considered as best response to item for newly graduated dentist by advisory committee.

TABLE 6-2

The Percentage of School Two Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment
Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 62	1975 N = 86	1976 N = 98	1977 N = 93	1978 N = 84
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	8.1	22.1	38.8	38.7	13.1
		after consultation with specialist	24.2	24.4	20.4	29.0	23.8
		*only in a hospital**	4.8	22.1	17.3	10.7	32.1
		*refer to dental specialist**	62.9	27.9	22.4	20.4	28.6
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	83.9	88.4	87.8	90.3	86.9
		after consultation with specialist	16.1	8.1	8.2	7.5	11.9
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	1.1	-
		refer to dental specialist	-	3.5	3.1	1.1	-
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	32.3	54.7	53.1	71.0	61.9
		*after consultation with specialist**	38.7	24.4	23.5	18.3	16.7
		only in a hospital	1.6	3.5	1.0	2.1	2.4
		refer to dental specialist	27.4	16.3	22.4	8.6	16.7
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	1.6	5.8	3.1	2.1	-
		*after consultation with specialist**	38.7	31.4	26.5	46.2	44.0
		only in a hospital	38.7	40.7	49.0	31.2	29.8
		refer to dental specialist	21.0	22.1	20.4	20.4	22.6
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	45.2	80.2	81.6	73.1	64.3
		after consultation with specialist	50.0	17.4	14.3	20.4	28.6
		only in a hospital	-	-	2.0	1.1	1.2
		refer to dental specialist	4.8	1.2	2.0	4.3	2.4
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	1.6	5.8	5.1	5.4	8.3
		after consultation with specialist	30.6	38.4	32.6	40.9	33.3
		*only in a hospital**	30.6	24.4	27.5	22.6	26.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	37.1	30.2	32.6	30.1	28.6
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	17.7	10.5	11.2	14.0	10.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	62.9	66.3	61.2	65.6	65.5
		only in a hospital	8.1	10.5	14.3	6.4	10.7
		refer to dental specialist	11.3	12.8	13.3	14.0	11.9
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	37.1	63.9	65.3	67.7	42.9
		after consultation with specialist	33.9	20.9	21.4	14.0	36.9
		only in a hospital	1.6	2.3	2.0	4.3	1.2
		refer to dental specialist	27.4	12.8	9.2	11.8	16.7

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	1.6	7.0	10.2	8.6	8.3
		after consultation with specialist	8.1	16.3	14.3	20.4	16.7
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	2.1	1.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	90.3	76.7	73.5	68.8	72.6
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	64.5	86.0	83.7	76.3	66.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	27.4	10.5	15.3	22.6	29.8
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	-	1.2
		refer to dental specialist	8.1	3.5	-	-	1.2
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	1.6	24.4	24.5	30.1	15.5
		after consultation with specialist	16.1	12.8	19.4	18.3	15.5
		only in a hospital	12.9	16.3	17.3	11.8	30.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	69.3	43.0	36.7	39.8	35.7
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	22.6	20.9	22.4	16.1	40.5
		*after consultation with specialist**	54.8	47.7	55.1	68.8	47.6
		only in a hospital	9.7	17.4	8.2	9.7	5.9
		refer to dental specialist	12.9	11.6	14.3	5.4	3.6
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	6.4	20.9	28.6	28.0	13.1
		after consultation with specialist	12.9	11.6	8.2	10.7	9.5
		*only in a hospital**	11.3	17.4	12.2	10.7	26.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	69.3	50.0	49.0	50.5	48.8
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	21.0	45.3	48.0	47.3	25.0
		after consultation with specialist	21.0	31.4	26.5	28.0	29.8
		only in a hospital	1.6	2.3	5.1	3.2	7.1
		refer to dental specialist	56.4	18.6	18.4	21.5	35.7
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	58.1	74.4	76.5	84.9	71.4
		after consultation with specialist	27.4	13.9	14.3	8.6	20.2
		only in a hospital	-	1.2	2.0	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	12.9	8.1	6.1	6.4	5.9
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	2.3	3.1	1.1	1.2
		after consultation with specialist	21.0	26.7	22.4	26.9	44.0
		*only in a hospital**	30.6	32.6	39.8	29.0	26.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	48.4	37.2	33.7	43.0	26.2
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	17.7	50.0	49.0	59.1	44.0
		after consultation with specialist	35.5	17.4	15.3	23.7	16.7
		*only in a hospital**	1.6	4.6	4.1	3.2	5.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	45.2	26.7	31.6	11.8	30.9

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	11.3	40.7	49.0	52.7	23.8
	after consultation with specialist	22.6	12.8	14.3	18.3	20.2
	*only in a hospital**	3.2	12.8	10.2	4.3	21.4
	*refer to dental specialist**	62.9	33.7	25.5	23.7	33.3
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	27.4	67.4	60.2	72.0	54.8
	after consultation with specialist	41.9	26.7	29.6	21.5	38.1
	only in a hospital	4.8	-	5.1	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	25.8	4.6	4.1	6.4	5.9
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	37.1	66.3	51.0	51.6	46.4
	after consultation with specialist	37.1	17.4	19.4	36.6	30.9
	only in a hospital	-	-	3.1	2.1	3.6
	*refer to dental specialist**	25.8	16.3	26.5	9.7	17.9
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	35.5	41.9	33.7	29.0	32.1
	*after consultation with specialist**	48.4	48.8	45.9	60.2	60.7
	only in a hospital	3.2	3.5	7.1	2.1	3.6
	refer to dental specialist	12.9	4.6	12.2	8.6	1.2
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	33.9	63.9	53.1	55.9	54.8
	after consultation with specialist	54.8	26.7	34.7	35.5	36.9
	only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	9.7	7.0	11.2	8.6	5.9
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	3.2	3.5	18.2	8.6	3.6
	*after consultation with specialist**	3.2	15.1	10.2	18.3	10.7
	only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	1.1	-
	refer to dental specialist	93.5	81.4	79.6	72.0	83.3
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	-	4.1	1.1	-
	after consultation with specialist	16.1	26.7	13.3	22.6	22.6
	*only in a hospital**	33.9	40.7	36.7	33.3	29.8
	refer to dental specialist	50.0	32.6	43.9	41.9	44.0
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	56.4	62.8	51.0	52.7	50.0
	*after consultation with specialist**	32.3	25.6	30.6	34.4	39.3
	only in a hospital	-	-	1.0	1.1	1.2
	refer to dental specialist	11.3	11.6	17.3	11.8	8.3

*Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

TABLE 6-3

The Percentage of School Three Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 35	1975 N = 37	1976**	1977**	1978**
1. A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	14.3	10.8			
	after consultation with specialist	14.3	27.0			
	*only in a hospital**	14.3	-			
	*refer to dental specialist**	54.3	59.5			
2. An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	80.0	70.3			
	after consultation with specialist	20.0	21.6			
	only in a hospital	-	-			
	refer to dental specialist	-	5.4			
3. A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	28.6	43.2			
	*after consultation with specialist**	57.1	24.3			
	only in a hospital	2.9	2.7			
	refer to dental specialist	11.4	29.7			
4. An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	-	2.7			
	*after consultation with specialist**	20.0	21.6			
	only in a hospital	54.3	43.2			
	refer to dental specialist	25.7	32.4			
5. A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	45.7	35.1			
	after consultation with specialist	42.9	45.9			
	only in a hospital	2.9	-			
	refer to dental specialist	8.6	18.9			
6. A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	-	-			
	after consultation with specialist	28.6	43.2			
	*only in a hospital**	25.7	16.2			
	*refer to dental specialist**	45.7	40.5			
7. An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	5.7	13.5			
	*after consultation with specialist**	68.6	51.3			
	only in a hospital	11.4	13.5			
	refer to dental specialist	14.3	21.6			
8. A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	31.4	37.8			
	after consultation with specialist	42.9	29.7			
	only in a hospital	2.9	2.7			
	refer to dental specialist	22.9	29.7			

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976**	1977**	1978**
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	8.6	10.8			
		after consultation with specialist	14.3	16.2			
		only in a hospital	-	2.7			
		*refer to dental specialist**	74.3	70.3			
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	65.7	51.3			
		*after consultation with specialist**	31.4	40.5			
		only in a hospital	-	2.7			
		refer to dental specialist	2.9	5.4			
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	2.9	10.8			
		after consultation with specialist	8.6	16.2			
		only in a hospital	14.3	5.4			
		*refer to dental specialist**	74.3	67.6			
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	14.3	18.9			
		*after consultation with specialist**	54.3	48.6			
		only in a hospital	17.1	24.3			
		refer to dental specialist	14.3	8.1			
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	8.6	13.5			
		after consultation with specialist	5.7	10.8			
		*only in a hospital**	5.7	8.1			
		*refer to dental specialist**	80.0	67.6			
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	20.0	32.4			
		after consultation with specialist	37.1	13.5			
		only in a hospital	2.9	2.7			
		refer to dental specialist	37.1	45.9			
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	68.6	45.9			
		after consultation with specialist	14.3	29.7			
		only in a hospital	-	2.7			
		refer to dental specialist	17.1	18.9			
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	-			
		after consultation with specialist	25.7	35.1			
		*only in a hospital**	25.7	16.2			
		*refer to dental specialist**	48.6	45.9			
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	20.0	32.4			
		after consultation with specialist	25.7	16.2			
		*only in a hospital**	2.9	5.4			
		*refer to dental specialist**	51.4	45.9			

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976**	1977**	1978**
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	14.3	13.5			
	after consultation with specialist	14.3	18.9			
	*only in a hospital**	2.9	5.4			
	*refer to dental specialist**	68.6	62.2			
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	37.1	24.3			
	after consultation with specialist	37.1	48.6			
	only in a hospital	2.9	2.7			
	refer to dental specialist	22.9	24.3			
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	42.9	43.2			
	after consultation with specialist	42.9	35.1			
	only in a hospital	2.9	2.7			
	*refer to dental specialist**	11.4	18.9			
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	22.9	29.7			
	*after consultation with specialist**	71.4	62.2			
	only in a hospital	5.7	5.4			
	refer to dental specialist	-	2.7			
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	42.9	27.0			
	after consultation with specialist	34.3	56.8			
	only in a hospital	5.7	2.7			
	refer to dental specialist	17.1	13.5			
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	17.1	2.7			
	*after consultation with specialist**	11.4	10.8			
	only in a hospital	-	5.4			
	refer to dental specialist	71.4	81.1			
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	2.7			
	after consultation with specialist	17.1	18.9			
	*only in a hospital**	37.1	37.8			
	refer to dental specialist	45.7	40.5			
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	48.6	40.5			
	*after consultation with specialist**	40.0	51.3			
	only in a hospital	5.7	2.7			
	refer to dental specialist	5.7	5.4			

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

**Data not available for this year

TABLE 6-4

The Percentage of School Four Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 23	1975 N = 106	1976 N = 112	1977**	1978 N = 122
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	13.0	22.6	13.4		12.3
		after consultation with specialist	26.1	32.1	36.6		22.9
		*only in a hospital**	39.1	19.8	26.8		35.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	21.7	23.6	23.2		27.9
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	91.3	83.0	75.0		83.6
		after consultation with specialist	4.3	13.2	23.2		14.7
		only in a hospital	-	0.9	-		-
		refer to dental specialist	4.3	0.9	1.8		-
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	60.9	60.4	54.5		46.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	21.7	24.5	33.9		29.5
		only in a hospital	4.3	1.9	1.8		1.6
		refer to dental specialist	13.0	8.5	9.8		20.5
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	4.3	1.9	0.9		-
		*after consultation with specialist**	21.7	35.8	31.2		24.6
		only in a hospital	56.5	45.3	41.1		44.3
		refer to dental specialist	13.0	14.1	25.9		29.5
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	65.2	69.8	67.0		62.3
		after consultation with specialist	30.4	21.7	29.5		32.8
		only in a hospital	4.3	1.9	0.9		0.8
		refer to dental specialist	-	2.8	2.7		1.6
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	13.0	10.4	4.5		4.1
		after consultation with specialist	47.8	62.3	53.6		76.2
		*only in a hospital**	26.1	12.3	24.1		12.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	13.0	12.3	17.9		5.7
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	13.0	14.1	11.6		6.6
		*after consultation with specialist**	69.6	62.3	69.6		66.4
		only in a hospital	13.0	15.1	10.7		14.7
		refer to dental specialist	4.3	4.7	8.0		9.8
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	60.9	62.3	55.4		40.2
		after consultation with specialist	30.4	20.7	29.5		36.9
		only in a hospital	8.7	4.7	2.7		7.4
		refer to dental specialist	-	9.4	11.6		13.1

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977**	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	-	7.5	1.8		6.6
		after consultation with specialist	8.7	11.3	10.7		11.5
		only in a hospital	-	0.9	2.7		0.8
		*refer to dental specialist**	91.3	78.3	83.9		79.5
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	56.5	70.7	66.1		66.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	43.5	22.6	29.5		28.7
		only in a hospital	-	0.9	0.9		2.5
		refer to dental specialist	-	4.7	1.8		-
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	17.4	18.9	9.8		11.5
		after consultation with specialist	13.0	24.5	31.2		19.7
		only in a hospital	30.4	25.5	23.2		36.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	34.8	29.2	33.0		30.3
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	17.4	7.5	5.4		16.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	65.2	66.0	73.2		63.9
		only in a hospital	17.4	15.1	9.8		9.0
		refer to dental specialist	-	9.4	9.8		9.0
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	4.3	11.3	8.9		2.5
		after consultation with specialist	4.3	14.1	14.3		11.5
		*only in a hospital**	39.1	19.8	17.0		20.5
		*refer to dental specialist**	47.8	53.8	58.9		63.9
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	34.8	40.6	35.7		32.8
		after consultation with specialist	30.4	29.2	39.3		37.7
		only in a hospital	-	5.7	5.4		7.4
		refer to dental specialist	26.1	20.7	19.6		20.5
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	87.0	71.7	59.8		64.7
		after consultation with specialist	8.7	20.7	26.8		20.5
		only in a hospital	-	1.9	1.8		2.5
		refer to dental specialist	4.3	4.7	11.6		9.8
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	4.3	4.7	-		1.6
		after consultation with specialist	39.1	40.6	31.2		53.3
		*only in a hospital**	47.8	34.9	42.0		21.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	8.7	17.0	25.9		20.5
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	39.1	52.8	29.5		34.4
		after consultation with specialist	30.4	19.8	34.8		22.9
		*only in a hospital**	13.0	10.4	7.1		6.6
		*refer to dental specialist**	17.4	14.1	25.0		32.0

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977**	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	26.1	31.1	24.1		17.2
	after consultation with specialist	17.4	27.4	29.5		15.6
	*only in a hospital**	34.8	14.1	8.9		26.2
	*refer to dental specialist**	21.7	26.4	37.5		38.5
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	47.8	55.7	48.2		44.3
	after consultation with specialist	39.1	31.1	37.5		35.2
	only in a hospital	8.7	6.6	4.5		10.7
	refer to dental specialist	4.3	4.7	9.8		8.2
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	56.5	53.8	48.2		54.9
	after consultation with specialist	30.4	35.8	38.4		32.0
	only in a hospital	4.3	1.9	1.8		5.7
	*refer to dental specialist**	8.7	7.5	10.7		4.1
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	52.2	38.7	24.1		20.5
	*after consultation with specialist**	47.8	55.7	65.2		71.3
	only in a hospital	-	-	2.7		3.3
	refer to dental specialist	-	4.7	7.1		3.3
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	39.1	50.9	34.8		45.1
	after consultation with specialist	60.9	35.8	56.2		42.6
	only in a hospital	-	4.7	3.6		2.5
	refer to dental specialist	-	5.7	3.6		7.4
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	4.3	1.9	1.8		4.9
	*after consultation with specialist**	4.3	11.3	6.2		7.4
	only in a hospital	-	0.9	1.8		0.8
	refer to dental specialist	91.3	83.0	90.2		85.2
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	0.9	0.9		-
	after consultation with specialist	8.7	19.8	15.2		10.7
	*only in a hospital**	69.6	52.8	45.5		48.4
	refer to dental specialist	21.7	23.6	36.6		39.3
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	52.2	65.1	43.7		62.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	43.5	32.1	49.1		35.2
	only in a hospital	-	-	2.7		0.8
	refer to dental specialist	4.3	1.9	2.7		-

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

**Data not available for this year.

figures for those choosing the preferred alternatives was 57.9, 54.9, 55.4, and 53.9. It should be remembered that the small number of students included in 1974 probably were not representative of the total student body.

School 05 showed the following average percentages for those choosing "routine office treatment": 31.9 in 1974, 36.5 in 1975, 41.4 in 1976, 36.5 in 1977, and 40.0 in 1978. Corresponding values for preferred alternatives were: 55.3, 56.5, 58.7, 57.3, and 59.1. Here there does seem to be a slight trend toward choosing "routine office treatment" and also towards agreement with the advisory committee's preferred alternatives.

School 06 was represented in 1974 through 1977, but with reduced numbers of cases in 1974 and 1977. Average percentages choosing "routine office treatment" over the four years were 35.6, 33.4, 42.0, and 45.5. Average percentages choosing the preferred alternatives were 56.2, 53.2, 58.7, and 59.0.

At School 07, the average percentages choosing "routine office treatment" were 34.4 in 1974, 35.8 in 1975, 36.4 in 1976, 33.8 in 1977, and 37.5 in 1978. Average percentages choosing the preferred alternatives were: 53.0, 51.9, 55.3, 53.5, and 57.3. In both instances, there may be a modest trend toward increasing agreement with the advisory committee's choices.

At School 08, the average percentages choosing "routine office treatment" were 29.8, 38.3, 34.0, 39.2, and 17.8. The average percentages choosing the preferred alternatives were 58.1, 53.0, 53.7, 57.3, and 32.7. The low averages in 1978 for both categories apparently came about because of a large increase in failure to respond, rather than because of students selecting choices different from those picked in the prior years.

TABLE 6-5

The Percentage of School Five Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 89	1975 N = 125	1976 N = 118	1977 N = 98	1978 N = 115
1. A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	14.6	23.2	20.3	20.4	16.5
	after consultation with specialist	13.5	24.0	29.7	26.5	25.2
	*only in a hospital**	11.2	8.8	16.9	9.2	13.9
	*refer to dental specialist**	59.5	40.8	31.4	43.9	44.3
2. An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	86.5	90.4	94.9	89.8	92.2
	after consultation with specialist	11.2	7.2	3.4	9.2	6.1
	only in a hospital	-	0.8	-	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	1.1	0.8	1.7	-	1.7
3. A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	36.0	38.4	59.3	42.9	44.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	29.2	29.6	22.0	40.8	32.2
	only in a hospital	2.2	2.4	1.7	1.0	1.7
	refer to dental specialist	31.5	25.6	16.9	14.3	21.7
4. An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	9.0	2.4	5.9	7.1	8.7
	*after consultation with specialist**	36.0	29.6	52.5	51.0	47.8
	only in a hospital	33.7	48.0	25.4	26.5	26.1
	refer to dental specialist	20.2	15.2	13.6	15.3	17.4
5. A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	57.3	70.4	84.7	77.5	79.1
	after consultation with specialist	28.1	24.0	9.3	15.3	20.0
	only in a hospital	3.4	-	0.8	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	10.1	3.2	5.1	5.1	0.9
6. A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	4.5	5.6	7.6	7.1	2.6
	after consultation with specialist	44.9	42.4	42.4	39.8	40.0
	*only in a hospital**	11.2	14.4	16.1	15.3	13.0
	*refer to dental specialist**	38.2	33.6	33.9	34.7	43.5
7. An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	16.8	20.8	14.4	11.2	16.5
	*after consultation with specialist**	65.2	59.2	58.5	64.3	61.7
	only in a hospital	7.9	10.4	10.2	9.2	11.3
	refer to dental specialist	9.0	6.4	14.4	12.2	10.4
8. A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	33.7	51.2	59.3	50.0	56.5
	after consultation with specialist	24.7	23.2	22.0	27.5	26.1
	only in a hospital	-	1.6	2.5	4.1	-
	refer to dental specialist	39.3	21.6	16.1	18.4	16.5

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9. A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	12.4	10.4	7.6	4.1	2.6
	after consultation with specialist	19.1	8.8	10.2	8.2	8.7
	only in a hospital	2.2	-	0.8	-	0.9
	*refer to dental specialist**	65.2	79.2	81.4	86.7	87.0
10. A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	66.3	81.6	89.8	85.7	81.7
	*after consultation with specialist**	28.1	14.4	9.3	12.2	14.8
	only in a hospital	1.1	-	-	2.0	-
	refer to dental specialist	3.4	3.2	0.8	-	3.5
11. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	5.6	12.0	13.6	8.2	7.0
	after consultation with specialist	13.5	10.4	11.9	11.2	13.9
	only in a hospital	7.9	8.0	16.1	9.2	9.6
	*refer to dental specialist**	71.9	68.0	58.5	69.4	69.6
12. A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	42.7	46.4	48.3	48.0	64.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	47.2	44.0	43.2	38.8	31.3
	only in a hospital	1.1	3.2	3.4	4.1	2.6
	refer to dental specialist	6.7	4.8	5.1	9.2	1.7
13. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	6.7	5.6	12.7	5.1	5.2
	after consultation with specialist	9.0	7.2	5.1	9.2	7.0
	*only in a hospital**	4.5	8.0	13.6	5.1	6.1
	*refer to dental specialist**	78.6	77.6	67.8	79.6	80.9
14. An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	16.8	39.2	48.3	38.8	44.3
	after consultation with specialist	33.7	24.0	22.9	23.5	29.6
	only in a hospital	1.1	-	3.4	4.1	0.9
	refer to dental specialist	41.6	35.2	25.4	31.6	24.3
15. A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	71.9	78.4	83.9	74.5	77.4
	after consultation with specialist	16.8	12.8	7.6	18.4	18.3
	only in a hospital	1.1	-	0.8	1.0	-
	refer to dental specialist	7.9	7.2	7.6	5.1	4.3
16. A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	4.5	5.6	1.7	7.1	4.3
	after consultation with specialist	33.7	40.0	50.8	35.7	39.1
	*only in a hospital**	20.2	15.2	20.3	17.3	17.4
	*refer to dental specialist**	39.3	[illegible]	26.3	36.7	39.1
17. A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	21.3	33.6	51.7	40.8	37.4
	after consultation with specialist	28.1	20.0	15.2	21.4	18.3
	*only in a hospital**	1.1	0.8	3.4	3.1	3.5
	*refer to dental specialist**	48.3	43.2	28.8	31.6	39.1

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	15.7	19.2	33.0	29.6	33.0
	after consultation with specialist	22.5	12.0	11.9	16.3	13.9
	*only in a hospital**	-	4.0	7.6	3.1	1.7
	*refer to dental specialist**	60.7	63.2	46.6	51.0	49.6
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	41.6	48.8	58.5	51.0	69.6
	after consultation with specialist	37.1	29.6	31.4	33.7	20.9
	only in a hospital	3.4	4.0	1.7	4.1	-
	refer to dental specialist	16.8	15.2	8.5	10.2	8.7
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	49.4	63.2	67.8	61.2	59.1
	after consultation with specialist	34.8	24.0	14.4	27.5	26.1
	only in a hospital	-	-	0.8	-	-
	*refer to dental specialist**	14.6	10.4	16.9	10.2	14.8
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	58.4	53.6	55.9	51.0	59.1
	*after consultation with specialist**	37.1	40.0	39.0	38.8	34.8
	only in a hospital	1.1	0.8	1.7	3.1	-
	refer to dental specialist	2.2	4.8	2.5	6.1	6.1
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	53.9	56.8	58.5	49.0	69.6
	after consultation with specialist	32.6	35.2	35.6	40.8	20.9
	only in a hospital	4.5	-	1.7	1.0	-
	refer to dental specialist	7.9	4.8	4.2	7.1	8.7
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	11.2	4.8	7.6	3.1	4.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	16.8	8.0	10.2	6.1	5.2
	only in a hospital	1.1	-	1.7	3.1	0.9
	refer to dental specialist	69.7	85.6	79.7	86.7	89.6
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	1.1	0.8	-	2.0	1.7
	after consultation with specialist	16.8	10.4	25.4	26.5	33.9
	*only in a hospital**	48.3	47.2	44.9	39.8	28.7
	refer to dental specialist	32.6	37.6	26.3	26.5	35.6
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	59.5	49.6	50.0	48.0	63.5
	*after consultation with specialist**	27.0	33.6	32.2	35.7	20.0
	only in a hospital	-	-	0.8	1.0	-
	refer to dental specialist	12.4	14.4	16.9	14.3	16.5

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

TABLE 6-6

The Percentage of School Six Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 73	1975 N = 113	1976 N = 130	1977 N = 84	1973**
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	20.5	24.8	45.4	48.8	
		after consultation with specialist	17.8	24.8	24.6	17.9	
		*only in a hospital**	39.7	8.0	12.3	9.5	
		*refer to dental specialist**	20.5	32.7	15.4	22.6	
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	87.7	85.0	92.3	88.1	
		after consultation with specialist	11.0	5.3	5.4	10.7	
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	
		refer to dental specialist	1.4	0.9	1.5	-	
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	42.5	47.8	62.3	77.4	
		*after consultation with specialist**	37.0	23.9	23.8	8.3	
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.5	-	
		refer to dental specialist	17.8	18.6	11.5	13.1	
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	2.7	1.8	3.1	5.9	
		*after consultation with specialist**	20.5	24.8	33.8	70.2	
		only in a hospital	56.2	43.4	52.3	13.1	
		refer to dental specialist	20.5	18.6	8.5	8.3	
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	75.3	70.8	89.2	90.5	
		after consultation with specialist	19.2	14.2	9.2	7.1	
		only in a hospital	4.1	0.9	-	1.2	
		refer to dental specialist	1.4	3.5	0.8	1.2	
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	9.6	4.4	7.7	8.3	
		after consultation with specialist	39.7	26.5	54.6	58.3	
		*only in a hospital**	34.2	35.4	16.9	9.5	
		*refer to dental specialist**	16.4	22.1	17.7	23.8	
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	19.2	15.9	14.6	13.1	
		*after consultation with specialist**	54.8	58.4	65.4	71.4	
		only in a hospital	19.2	13.3	12.3	5.9	
		refer to dental specialist	5.5	3.5	6.9	7.1	
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	43.8	37.2	68.5	64.3	
		after consultation with specialist	26.0	30.1	17.7	16.7	
		only in a hospital	16.4	4.4	2.3	2.4	
		refer to dental specialist	13.7	18.6	10.8	15.5	

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978**
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	5.5	5.3	10.0	5.9	
		after consultation with specialist	13.7	15.0	16.1	17.9	
		only in a hospital	1.4	0.9	0.8	-	
		*refer to dental specialist**	79.4	69.9	72.3	76.2	
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	83.6	72.6	84.6	80.9	
		*after consultation with specialist**	16.4	17.7	13.8	19.1	
		only in a hospital	-	-	0.8	-	
		refer to dental specialist	-	0.9	-	-	
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	15.1	15.0	24.6	29.8	
		after consultation with specialist	12.3	15.0	14.6	10.7	
		only in a hospital	41.1	11.5	26.9	16.7	
		*refer to dental specialist**	31.5	48.7	30.0	41.7	
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	20.5	13.3	8.5	17.9	
		*after consultation with specialist**	50.7	49.6	66.9	69.0	
		only in a hospital	21.9	15.9	11.5	4.8	
		refer to dental specialist	6.8	11.5	9.2	8.3	
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	13.7	12.4	23.8	40.5	
		after consultation with specialist	11.0	10.6	16.9	5.9	
		*only in a hospital**	27.4	15.0	23.1	13.1	
		*refer to dental specialist**	47.9	52.2	34.6	40.5	
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	37.0	42.5	53.8	59.5	
		after consultation with specialist	31.5	27.4	24.6	23.8	
		only in a hospital	6.8	3.5	6.1	3.6	
		refer to dental specialist	20.5	15.9	8.5	11.9	
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	86.3	77.0	90.8	95.2	
		after consultation with specialist	11.0	10.6	6.1	2.4	
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	
		refer to dental specialist	2.7	3.5	1.5	2.4	
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	2.7	4.4	4.6	4.8	
		after consultation with specialist	21.9	18.6	50.0	47.6	
		*only in a hospital**	50.7	43.4	25.4	17.9	
		*refer to dental specialist**	24.7	23.0	16.1	26.2	
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	30.1	45.1	50.0	65.5	
		after consultation with specialist	28.8	15.0	23.8	11.9	
		*only in a hospital**	12.3	5.3	9.2	3.6	
		*refer to dental specialist**	28.8	25.7	14.6	17.9	

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978**
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	28.8	35.4	31.5	48.8	
	after consultation with specialist	17.8	15.0	16.1	10.7	
	*only in a hospital**	17.8	6.2	19.2	8.3	
	*refer to dental specialist**	35.6	34.5	31.5	30.9	
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	37.0	43.4	73.1	72.6	
	after consultation with specialist	38.4	40.7	24.6	21.4	
	only in a hospital	16.4	2.6	-	-	
	refer to dental specialist	8.2	4.4	0.8	3.6	
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	61.6	60.2	63.1	66.7	
	after consultation with specialist	28.8	19.5	29.2	26.2	
	only in a hospital	2.7	0.9	1.5	-	
	*refer to dental specialist**	6.8	10.6	3.8	7.1	
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	43.8	24.8	19.2	28.6	
	*after consultation with specialist**	47.9	57.5	71.5	66.7	
	only in a hospital	6.8	4.4	3.8	2.4	
	refer to dental specialist	1.4	3.5	3.1	1.2	
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	52.0	43.4	70.8	61.9	
	after consultation with specialist	39.7	37.2	26.1	32.1	
	only in a hospital	2.7	1.8	-	1.2	
	refer to dental specialist	5.5	8.8	0.8	4.8	
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	9.6	5.3	2.3	4.8	
	*after consultation with specialist**	11.0	15.0	18.5	20.2	
	only in a hospital	1.4	1.8	2.3	2.4	
	refer to dental specialist	78.1	69.0	73.8	70.2	
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	-	1.5	3.6	
	after consultation with specialist	5.5	13.3	24.6	57.1	
	*only in a hospital**	57.5	45.1	56.9	22.6	
	refer to dental specialist	37.0	30.1	13.1	13.1	
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	60.3	48.7	56.1	51.2	
	*after consultation with specialist**	28.8	36.3	33.8	39.1	
	only in a hospital	2.7	1.8	2.3	-	
	refer to dental specialist	8.2	4.4	6.9	9.5	

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

**Data not available for this year.

TABLE 6-7

The Percentage of School Seven Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 54	1975 N = 47	1976 N = 53	1977 N = 38	1978 N = 41
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	11.1	31.9	28.3	23.7	14.6
		after consultation with specialist	38.9	17.0	13.2	39.5	26.8
		*only in a hospital**	27.8	12.8	17.0	13.2	26.8
		*refer to dental specialist**	18.5	34.0	37.7	21.0	31.7
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	90.7	80.8	86.8	81.6	97.6
		after consultation with specialist	7.4	8.5	11.3	15.8	2.4
		only in a hospital	-	2.1	-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	-	6.4	-	-	-
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	35.2	48.9	37.7	36.8	36.6
		*after consultation with specialist**	31.5	21.3	30.2	34.2	43.9
		only in a hospital	-	4.3	3.8	-	2.4
		refer to dental specialist	31.5	23.4	26.4	26.3	17.1
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	5.6	6.4	1.9	2.6	2.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	27.8	46.8	41.5	26.3	43.9
		only in a hospital	46.3	23.4	32.1	28.9	29.3
		refer to dental specialist	18.5	19.1	20.7	36.8	24.4
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	48.1	61.7	83.0	76.3	80.5
		after consultation with specialist	42.6	21.3	11.3	15.8	14.6
		only in a hospital	3.7	-	-	-	2.4
		refer to dental specialist	1.8	14.9	3.8	5.3	2.4
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	14.8	14.9	3.8	5.3	4.9
		after consultation with specialist	35.2	38.3	43.4	34.2	48.8
		*only in a hospital**	27.8	12.8	15.1	21.0	34.1
		*refer to dental specialist**	20.4	31.9	35.8	34.2	12.2
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	24.1	25.5	15.1	7.9	21.9
		*after consultation with specialist**	61.1	46.8	58.5	63.2	56.1
		only in a hospital	9.3	2.1	9.4	2.6	4.9
		refer to dental specialist	3.7	21.3	13.2	18.4	12.2
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	38.9	44.7	54.7	31.6	41.5
		after consultation with specialist	42.6	23.4	24.5	28.9	19.5
		only in a hospital	7.4	4.3	-	5.3	9.8
		refer to dental specialist	9.3	23.4	17.0	28.9	29.3

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9. A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	3.7	6.4	1.9	2.6	9.8
	after consultation with specialist	13.0	10.6	5.7	23.7	21.9
	only in a hospital	-	2.1	3.8	2.6	-
	*refer to dental specialist**	81.5	78.7	86.8	65.8	68.3
10. A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	85.2	72.3	84.9	81.6	87.8
	*after consultation with specialist**	9.3	17.0	9.4	13.2	9.8
	only in a hospital	1.8	2.1	-	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	1.8	6.4	1.9	2.6	-
11. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	9.3	17.0	15.1	7.9	17.1
	after consultation with specialist	16.7	10.6	26.4	18.4	9.8
	only in a hospital	37.0	12.8	11.3	18.4	39.0
	*refer to dental specialist**	35.2	55.3	43.4	52.6	34.1
12. A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	29.6	34.0	26.4	42.1	41.5
	*after consultation with specialist**	55.6	42.5	56.6	44.7	51.2
	only in a hospital	9.3	2.2	5.7	2.6	2.4
	refer to dental specialist	3.7	19.1	5.7	5.3	2.4
13. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	3.7	12.8	15.1	13.2	14.6
	after consultation with specialist	13.0	8.5	11.3	15.8	7.3
	*only in a hospital**	35.2	17.0	17.0	15.8	51.2
	*refer to dental specialist**	46.3	57.4	50.9	50.0	26.8
14. An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	31.5	29.8	50.9	28.9	24.4
	after consultation with specialist	31.5	25.5	20.7	31.6	36.6
	only in a hospital	5.6	4.3	1.9	5.3	17.1
	refer to dental specialist	24.1	36.2	22.6	28.9	21.9
15. A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	75.9	55.3	64.1	76.3	68.3
	after consultation with specialist	20.4	19.1	17.0	13.2	24.4
	only in a hospital	-	2.1	1.9	-	2.4
	refer to dental specialist	1.8	19.1	13.2	7.9	4.9
16. A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	6.4	1.9	2.6	4.9
	after consultation with specialist	16.7	23.4	30.2	31.6	17.1
	*only in a hospital**	46.3	29.8	26.4	31.6	51.2
	*refer to dental specialist**	35.2	31.9	35.8	26.3	26.8
17. A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	29.6	46.8	41.5	31.6	39.0
	after consultation with specialist	27.8	17.0	28.3	26.3	21.9
	*only in a hospital**	7.4	4.3	-	7.9	7.3
	*refer to dental specialist**	31.5	29.8	28.3	28.9	29.3

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18.	A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	16.7	38.3	34.0	21.0	19.5
		after consultation with specialist	25.9	10.6	17.0	[illegible]	9.8
		*only in a hospital**	14.8	10.6	3.8	7.9	26.8
		*refer to dental specialist**	40.7	36.2	41.5	36.8	41.5
19.	A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	50.0	53.2	52.8	57.9	48.8
		after consultation with specialist	37.0	23.4	24.5	26.3	24.4
		only in a hospital	1.8	6.4	-	-	14.6
		refer to dental specialist	9.3	14.9	18.9	13.2	9.8
20.	An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	68.5	51.1	50.9	57.9	73.2
		after consultation with specialist	16.7	17.0	32.1	18.4	14.6
		only in a hospital	1.8	8.5	3.8	-	4.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	11.1	19.1	11.3	21.0	4.9
21.	A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	55.6	46.8	50.9	42.1	51.2
		*after consultation with specialist**	38.9	31.9	39.6	47.4	46.3
		only in a hospital	1.8	6.4	1.9	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	1.8	12.8	3.8	5.3	-
22.	A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	53.7	51.1	49.1	60.5	65.8
		after consultation with specialist	40.7	25.5	26.4	28.9	21.9
		only in a hospital	1.8	2.1	3.8	-	4.9
		refer to dental specialist	1.8	19.1	15.1	5.3	4.9
23.	A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	5.6	6.4	-	5.3	4.9
		*after consultation with specialist**	5.6	12.8	15.1	26.3	9.8
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	87.0	78.7	81.1	63.2	82.9
24.	A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	-	1.9	2.6	-
		after consultation with specialist	7.4	14.9	18.9	13.2	12.2
		*only in a hospital**	48.1	31.9	30.2	34.2	48.8
		refer to dental specialist	42.6	44.7	45.3	47.4	36.6
25.	An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	74.1	53.2	58.5	44.7	65.8
		*after consultation with specialist**	16.7	34.0	28.3	36.8	31.7
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	2.6	-
		refer to dental specialist	7.4	10.6	7.5	10.5	-

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

TABLE 6-8

The Percentage of School Eight Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 34	1975 N = 31	1976 N = 39	1977 N = 45	1978 N = 38
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	23.5	29.0	15.4	28.9	7.9
		after consultation with specialist	11.8	29.0	41.0	17.8	13.2
		*only in a hospital**	11.8	9.7	10.3	17.8	7.9
		*refer to dental specialist**	52.9	29.0	28.2	35.6	28.9
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	85.3	77.4	84.6	86.7	44.7
		after consultation with specialist	11.8	12.9	10.3	11.1	13.2
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	2.9	6.4	-	2.2	-
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	50.0	61.3	53.8	57.8	34.2
		*after consultation with specialist**	23.5	19.3	17.9	24.4	13.2
		only in a hospital	5.9	-	-	-	2.6
		refer to dental specialist	20.6	16.1	20.5	17.8	7.9
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary teeth	*routine office treatment*	-	12.9	7.6	6.7	-
		*after consultation with specialist**	11.8	38.7	23.1	46.7	10.5
		only in a hospital	73.5	32.3	48.7	35.6	31.6
		refer to dental specialist	11.8	12.9	17.9	8.9	15.8
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	61.8	74.2	69.2	73.3	39.5
		after consultation with specialist	29.4	16.1	20.5	15.6	18.4
		only in a hospital	2.9	-	2.6	2.2	-
		refer to dental specialist	5.9	6.4	2.6	6.7	-
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	5.9	12.9	12.8	11.1	2.6
		after consultation with specialist	41.2	41.9	46.1	46.7	31.6
		*only in a hospital**	32.3	29.0	23.1	26.7	13.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	20.6	12.9	12.8	13.3	10.5
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	20.6	29.0	12.8	28.9	5.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	73.5	41.9	61.5	48.9	36.8
		only in a hospital	-	19.3	15.4	6.7	7.9
		refer to dental specialist	5.9	3.2	5.1	15.6	5.3
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	38.2	67.7	64.1	51.1	23.7
		after consultation with specialist	29.4	16.1	20.5	24.4	15.8
		only in a hospital	5.9	3.2	-	4.4	2.6
		refer to dental specialist	26.5	9.7	7.7	20.0	15.8

90

85

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9. A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	8.8	6.4	7.7	17.8	2.6
	after consultation with specialist	5.9	25.8	15.4	8.9	5.3
	only in a hospital	-	-	-	2.2	2.6
	*refer to dental specialist**	82.3	64.5	71.8	68.9	47.4
10. A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	70.6	58.1	69.2	75.6	36.8
	*after consultation with specialist**	26.5	38.7	23.1	20.0	18.4
	only in a hospital	2.9	-	-	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	-	-	-	4.4	2.6
11. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	11.8	19.3	23.1	13.3	7.9
	after consultation with specialist	8.8	12.9	20.5	15.6	5.3
	only in a hospital	11.8	19.3	10.3	13.3	13.2
	*refer to dental specialist**	67.6	41.9	38.5	53.3	31.6
12. A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	23.5	32.3	23.1	26.7	21.0
	*after consultation with specialist**	73.5	51.6	53.8	64.4	28.9
	only in a hospital	-	6.5	10.3	2.2	2.6
	refer to dental specialist	2.9	6.5	5.1	4.4	5.3
13. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	8.8	25.8	10.3	8.9	7.9
	after consultation with specialist	8.8	3.2	7.7	11.1	2.6
	*only in a hospital**	20.6	25.8	12.8	15.6	10.5
	*refer to dental specialist**	61.8	41.9	64.1	62.2	36.8
14. An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	29.4	25.8	35.9	37.8	21.0
	after consultation with specialist	23.5	29.0	38.5	17.8	18.4
	only in a hospital	11.8	-	-	6.7	5.3
	refer to dental specialist	35.3	41.9	20.5	37.8	13.2
15. A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	64.7	71.0	74.4	71.1	26.3
	after consultation with specialist	23.5	16.1	15.4	6.7	18.4
	only in a hospital	2.9	-	-	2.2	2.6
	refer to dental specialist	8.8	9.7	5.1	20.0	10.5
16. A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	3.2	-	6.7	-
	after consultation with specialist	38.2	35.5	20.5	31.1	21.0
	*only in a hospital**	41.2	41.9	41.0	35.6	21.0
	*refer to dental specialist**	20.6	16.1	33.3	24.4	15.8
17. A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	17.6	48.4	35.9	51.1	28.9
	after consultation with specialist	23.5	16.1	12.8	15.6	10.5
	*only in a hospital**	8.8	-	12.8	6.7	5.3
	*refer to dental specialist**	50.0	29.0	33.3	26.7	13.2

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18. A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	17.6	38.7	38.5	37.8	13.2
	after consultation with specialist	14.7	16.1	7.7	8.9	13.2
	*only in a hospital**	14.7	3.2	10.3	4.4	10.5
	*refer to dental specialist**	52.9	38.7	35.9	48.9	21.0
19. A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	41.2	61.3	43.6	62.2	31.6
	after consultation with specialist	29.4	19.3	35.9	26.7	13.2
	only in a hospital	2.9	6.4	2.6	2.2	2.6
	refer to dental specialist	26.5	9.7	12.8	8.9	10.5
20. An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	47.1	54.8	43.6	68.9	31.6
	after consultation with specialist	47.1	29.0	35.9	22.2	13.2
	only in a hospital	2.9	3.2	5.1	2.2	2.6
	*refer to dental specialist**	2.9	9.7	10.3	6.7	10.5
21. A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	20.6	41.9	28.2	31.1	7.9
	*after consultation with specialist**	64.7	54.8	51.3	57.8	44.7
	only in a hospital	11.8	-	2.6	-	2.6
	refer to dental specialist	2.9	-	12.8	8.9	2.6
22. A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	29.4	48.4	43.6	53.3	21.0
	after consultation with specialist	52.9	25.8	35.9	31.1	31.6
	only in a hospital	-	6.4	5.1	2.2	-
	refer to dental specialist	17.6	12.9	10.3	13.3	2.6
23. A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	8.8	3.2	2.6	-	2.6
	*after consultation with specialist**	2.9	6.4	2.6	2.2	7.9
	only in a hospital	2.9	3.2	5.1	4.4	-
	refer to dental specialist	85.3	83.9	84.6	93.3	47.4
24. A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	9.7	-	2.2	-
	after consultation with specialist	5.9	35.5	12.8	24.4	5.3
	*only in a hospital**	70.6	45.2	46.1	53.3	39.5
	refer to dental specialist	23.5	6.5	35.9	15.6	13.2
25. An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	58.8	45.2	53.8	71.1	26.3
	*after consultation with specialist**	35.3	45.2	33.3	26.7	28.9
	only in a hospital	-	3.2	-	-	-
	refer to dental specialist	5.9	3.2	7.7	2.2	2.6

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

School 09 was represented only in 1976, 1977, and 1978. Average percentages for those choosing "routine office treatment" were 37.3, 41.8, and 42.8. The average percentages for the preferred choices were 52.4, 51.9, and 54.2.

At School 10, average percentages of those choosing "routine office treatment" were 27.4 in 1974, 34.1 in 1975, 34.3 in 1976, 34.8 in 1977, and 32.1 in 1978. Corresponding values for the preferred alternatives were 57.5, 56.5, 55.8, 58.1, and 54.4. No trends appear in these data.

At School 11, the average percentages of those choosing "routine office treatment" were 32.5, 31.3, 31.5, 28.0, and 33.1. Values for the preferred alternatives were 58.2, 55.8, 53.4, 57.3, and 52.5. In the latter instance, if there is a trend, it is a reverse one.

To summarize, overall there appeared to be a trend for increasing numbers of students to select "routine office treatment" as the preferred alternative, although there was considerable variation in patterns at individual schools.

Background Characteristics

Table 7 shows for all students, for the years 1974 through 1978, data on several different background characteristics, including expected professional activity after graduation, undergraduate major, whether or not the student had had full-time work experience, whether or not the student had had military or Peace Corps experience, whether or not there was a handicapped person in the family, and, for the years 1975 through 1978, the student's attitude toward treating handicapped people.

Under professional activity, self-employed professional practice was the expectation of more than one-fourth of the students in every year and the clear favorite. Professional partnership was the choice of about 20 percent in

TABLE 6-9

The Percentage of School Nine Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974**	1975**	1976 N = 133	1977 N = 121	1978 N = 169
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*			26.3	29.7	21.9
		after consultation with specialist			21.8	26.4	19.5
		*only in a hospital**			16.5	12.4	25.4
		*refer to dental specialist**			30.8	28.1	31.9
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**			87.2	90.9	93.5
		after consultation with specialist			8.3	6.6	3.0
		only in a hospital			-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist			0.7	0.8	2.4
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**			57.9	67.8	53.8
		*after consultation with specialist**			21.0	12.4	19.5
		only in a hospital			1.5	2.5	6.5
		refer to dental specialist			15.8	15.7	18.9
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary	*routine office treatment*			3.8	3.3	4.1
		*after consultation with specialist**			30.1	26.4	25.4
		only in a hospital			48.9	43.0	56.2
		refer to [illegible] specialist			11.3	24.0	12.4
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine [illegible] treatment**			66.9	69.4	76.3
		after consultation with specialist			20.3	14.9	18.3
		only in a hospital			2.3	2.5	0.6
		refer to dental specialist			5.3	9.1	3.5
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*			15.0	23.1	14.8
		after consultation with specialist			52.6	49.6	45.6
		*only in a hospital**			14.3	12.4	23.1
		*refer to dental specialist**			12.8	12.4	14.8
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*			13.5	21.5	18.3
		*after consultation with specialist**			51.1	43.0	47.3
		only in a hospital			18.0	16.5	21.9
		refer to dental specialist			10.5	14.9	10.6
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**			48.1	55.4	57.4
		after consultation with specialist			24.1	18.2	20.1
		only in a hospital			8.3	5.0	5.9
		refer to dental specialist			15.8	19.0	14.8

Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974**	1975**	1976	1977	1978
9. A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*			4.5	4.1	5.3
	after consultation with specialist			9.0	9.1	13.0
	only in a hospital			0.7	2.5	3.0
	*refer to dental specialist**			79.7	81.8	76.9
10. A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**			73.7	72.7	72.8
	*after consultation with specialist**			15.8	17.4	19.5
	only in a hospital			2.3	2.5	0.6
	refer to dental specialist			3.0	5.8	4.1
11. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*			25.6	28.1	27.2
	after consultation with specialist			16.5	14.9	16.6
	only in a hospital			22.6	17.4	18.9
	*refer to dental specialist**			30.1	38.0	34.3
12. A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*			17.3	49.6	38.5
	*after consultation with specialist**			57.1	33.9	43.2
	only in a hospital			6.0	7.4	7.1
	refer to dental specialist			13.5	6.6	9.5
13. A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*			11.3	16.5	17.2
	after consultation with specialist			12.0	9.1	16.0
	*only in a hospital**			21.0	19.8	23.1
	*refer to dental specialist**			51.1	52.1	42.6
14. An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**			31.6	52.1	43.2
	after consultation with specialist			29.3	16.5	23.1
	only in a hospital			6.8	6.6	6.5
	refer to dental specialist			27.8	22.3	24.8
15. A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**			66.9	59.5	64.5
	after consultation with specialist			17.3	14.0	18.3
	only in a hospital			2.3	4.1	2.4
	refer to dental specialist			9.0	18.2	13.6
16. A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*			4.5	9.9	13.0
	after consultation with specialist			24.8	29.7	26.0
	*only in a hospital**			40.6	28.1	30.8
	*refer to dental specialist**			23.3	29.7	27.8
17. A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*			45.9	46.3	49.1
	after consultation with specialist			15.0	12.4	11.2
	*only in a hospital**			6.0	8.3	6.5
	*refer to dental specialist**			27.1	30.6	31.9

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974**	1975**	1976	1977	1978
18.	A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*			38.3	32.2	35.5
		after consultation with specialist			12.0	17.4	14.8
		*only in a hospital**			14.3	11.6	11.8
		*refer to dental specialist**			31.6	37.2	36.7
19.	A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**			53.4	57.0	57.4
		after consultation with specialist			23.3	21.5	24.8
		only in a hospital			4.5	5.0	5.9
		refer to dental specialist			13.5	14.9	10.1
20.	An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*			60.1	62.8	66.9
		after consultation with specialist			25.6	22.3	20.1
		only in a hospital			4.5	4.1	3.0
		*refer to dental specialist**			3.8	9.1	8.9
21.	A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*			41.3	57.0	45.6
		*after consultation with specialist**			42.1	31.4	36.7
		only in a hospital			6.0	2.5	8.3
		refer to dental specialist			5.3	7.4	7.7
22.	A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**			60.1	50.4	52.1
		after consultation with specialist			24.1	28.1	33.7
		only in a hospital			2.3	4.1	7.1
		refer to dental specialist			8.3	14.9	5.3
23.	A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*			4.5	5.8	4.7
		*after consultation with specialist**			4.5	6.6	11.8
		only in a hospital			4.5	5.8	3.0
		refer to dental specialist			81.2	79.3	78.7
24.	A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*			3.8	3.3	3.5
		after consultation with specialist			11.3	10.7	10.6
		*only in a hospital**			51.1	47.9	59.8
		refer to dental specialist			27.8	33.1	24.8
25.	An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**			70.7	77.7	82.8
		*after consultation with specialist**			18.8	14.9	12.4
		only in a hospital			1.5	0.8	0.6
		refer to dental specialist			2.3	5.0	3.0

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

**Data not available for this year.

TABLE 6-10

The Percentage of School Ten Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 40	1975 N = 101	1976 N = 70	1977 N = 74	1978 N = 75
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	7.5	18.8	20.0	20.3	12.0
		after consultation with specialist	30.0	14.8	20.0	17.6	5.3
		*only in a hospital**	27.5	23.8	30.0	18.9	38.7
		*refer to dental specialist**	35.0	41.6	28.6	39.2	40.0
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	65.0	74.3	71.4	79.7	73.3
		after consultation with specialist	35.0	21.8	27.1	14.9	22.7
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	1.3	-
		refer to dental specialist	-	4.0	1.4	2.7	1.3
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	57.5	57.4	52.9	55.4	54.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	25.0	21.8	24.3	25.7	24.0
		only in a hospital	2.5	1.0	7.1	1.3	1.3
		refer to dental specialist	15.0	19.8	15.7	13.5	17.3
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary	*routine office treatment*	-	1.0	1.4	1.3	2.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	20.0	33.7	51.4	45.9	57.3
		only in a hospital	47.5	46.5	22.9	31.1	20.0
		refer to dental specialist	32.5	17.8	20.0	18.9	16.0
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	47.5	72.3	81.4	74.3	69.3
		after consultation with specialist	45.0	19.8	14.3	21.6	16.0
		only in a hospital	2.5	3.0	1.4	1.3	2.7
		refer to dental specialist	5.0	4.0	1.4	1.3	8.0
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	-	5.9	5.7	-	5.3
		after consultation with specialist	45.0	48.5	52.9	58.1	58.7
		*only in a hospital**	20.0	17.8	12.9	14.9	12.0
		*refer to dental specialist**	35.0	27.7	24.3	24.3	21.3
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	2.5	7.9	11.4	12.2	9.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	72.5	66.3	67.1	64.9	65.3
		only in a hospital	7.5	14.8	7.1	6.8	6.7
		refer to dental specialist	17.5	10.9	10.0	13.5	13.3
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	40.0	53.5	50.0	47.3	38.7
		after consultation with specialist	22.5	23.8	31.4	27.0	28.0
		only in a hospital	12.5	7.9	10.0	4.0	9.3
		refer to dental specialist	25.0	13.9	7.1	18.9	21.3

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	15.0	10.9	10.0	5.4	13.3
		after consultation with specialist	5.0	19.8	18.6	16.2	22.7
		only in a hospital	7.5	-	1.4	1.3	-
		*refer to dental specialist**	72.5	69.3	70.0	74.3	61.3
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	57.5	69.3	78.6	81.1	77.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	40.0	26.7	21.4	10.8	14.7
		only in a hospital	2.5	1.0	-	1.3	2.7
		refer to dental specialist	-	3.0	-	5.4	2.7
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	2.5	9.9	8.6	12.2	4.0
		after consultation with specialist	5.0	15.8	12.9	10.8	12.0
		only in a hospital	37.5	26.7	42.9	29.7	40.0
		*refer to dental specialist**	55.0	46.5	32.9	45.9	41.3
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	10.0	14.8	17.1	18.9	32.0
		*after consultation with specialist**	72.5	65.3	65.7	75.7	57.3
		only in a hospital	7.5	10.9	11.4	2.7	4.0
		refer to dental specialist	10.0	6.9	2.9	1.3	2.7
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	-	15.8	11.4	10.8	6.7
		after consultation with specialist	5.0	9.9	8.6	12.2	6.7
		*only in a hospital**	30.0	17.8	37.1	20.3	29.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	65.0	55.4	42.9	55.4	54.7
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	25.0	42.6	50.0	44.6	34.7
		after consultation with specialist	25.0	30.7	20.0	25.7	28.0
		only in a hospital	12.5	4.0	11.4	8.1	10.7
		refer to dental specialist	37.5	22.8	17.1	17.6	24.0
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	65.0	80.2	78.6	71.6	62.7
		after consultation with specialist	17.5	11.9	14.3	10.8	14.7
		only in a hospital	2.5	1.0	1.4	1.3	5.3
		refer to dental specialist	15.0	6.9	5.7	13.5	14.7
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	4.0	2.9	4.0	6.7
		after consultation with specialist	30.0	45.5	45.7	44.6	50.7
		*only in a hospital**	32.5	31.7	28.6	24.3	17.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	32.5	18.8	20.0	23.0	22.7
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	50.0	50.5	52.9	47.3	52.0
		after consultation with specialist	2.5	16.8	11.4	12.2	10.7
		*only in a hospital**	10.0	9.9	17.1	9.5	9.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	35.0	22.8	15.7	29.7	25.3

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18.	A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	7.5	28.7	31.4	29.7	21.3
		after consultation with specialist	17.5	12.9	20.0	14.9	10.7
		*only in a hospital**	30.0	16.8	24.3	13.5	25.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	45.0	40.6	24.3	40.5	40.0
19.	A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	45.0	55.4	45.7	62.2	45.3
		after consultation with specialist	37.5	29.7	31.4	28.4	25.3
		only in a hospital	7.5	8.9	11.4	2.7	9.3
		refer to dental specialist	10.0	4.0	11.4	5.4	14.7
20.	An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	37.5	43.6	47.1	45.9	46.7
		after consultation with specialist	37.5	36.3	38.6	33.8	24.0
		only in a hospital	2.5	4.0	1.4	1.3	2.7
		*refer to dental specialist**	22.5	15.8	12.9	17.6	24.0
21.	A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	35.0	33.7	32.9	23.0	36.0
		*after consultation with specialist**	62.5	56.4	65.7	68.9	57.3
		only in a hospital	-	4.9	1.4	1.3	2.7
		refer to dental specialist	2.5	4.9	-	5.4	1.3
22.	A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	40.0	36.6	35.7	60.8	36.0
		after consultation with specialist	42.5	56.4	55.7	32.4	41.3
		only in a hospital	10.0	2.0	1.4	-	5.3
		refer to dental specialist	5.0	2.0	5.7	4.0	14.7
23.	A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	10.0	11.9	10.0	6.8	6.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	15.0	14.8	5.7	9.5	18.7
		only in a hospital	2.5	-	1.4	2.7	-
		refer to dental specialist	72.5	73.3	81.4	79.7	70.7
24.	A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	-	-	-	-
		after consultation with specialist	7.5	22.8	28.6	33.8	40.0
		*only in a hospital**	52.5	43.6	35.7	37.8	22.7
		refer to dental specialist	40.0	32.7	30.0	25.7	33.3
25.	An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	65.0	53.5	51.4	55.4	56.0
		*after consultation with specialist**	22.5	33.7	40.0	29.7	32.0
		only in a hospital	2.5	-	2.9	-	1.3
		refer to dental specialist	10.0	11.9	5.7	13.5	8.0

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

TABLE 6-11

The Percentage of School Eleven Students Who Chose Each Patient Treatment Alternative Concerning Different Kinds of Patients, by Year

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974 N = 63	1975 N = 81	1976 N = 88	1977 N = 72	1978 N = 90
1.	A severely retarded 8-year-old girl with extensive caries in the primary dentition, together with gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment*	7.9	7.4	12.5	6.9	12.2
		after consultation with specialist	15.9	30.9	25.0	20.8	34.4
		*only in a hospital**	54.0	39.5	32.9	43.1	23.3
		*refer to dental specialist**	19.0	18.5	26.1	26.4	24.4
2.	An arthritic 64-year-old man with moderate periodontal disease	*routine office treatment**	87.3	85.2	87.5	69.4	82.2
		after consultation with specialist	12.7	12.3	7.9	23.6	13.3
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	-	2.5	2.3	4.2	-
3.	A blind and deaf patient with marked gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	38.1	50.6	45.4	43.1	56.7
		*after consultation with specialist**	47.6	35.8	38.6	34.7	30.0
		only in a hospital	1.6	-	2.3	-	2.2
		refer to dental specialist	12.7	9.9	10.2	18.1	6.7
4.	An 18-year-old hemophiliac with deep carious lesions in several maxillary	*routine office treatment*	1.6	1.2	2.3	2.8	3.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	34.9	44.4	43.2	37.5	41.1
		only in a hospital	44.4	34.6	40.9	37.5	34.4
		refer to dental specialist	17.5	16.0	11.4	20.8	16.7
5.	A cooperative 12-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, carious lesions in several teeth, and severe gingivitis	*routine office treatment**	66.7	75.3	71.6	72.2	70.0
		after consultation with specialist	31.7	19.7	19.3	22.2	22.2
		only in a hospital	-	1.2	2.3	2.8	2.2
		refer to dental specialist	1.6	1.2	4.5	1.4	1.1
6.	A severely hypertensive 58-year-old man in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	9.5	8.6	4.5	2.8	4.4
		after consultation with specialist	42.9	50.6	35.2	23.6	33.3
		*only in a hospital**	27.0	9.9	22.7	23.6	20.0
		*refer to dental specialist**	20.6	23.5	31.8	47.2	37.8
7.	An 8-year-old girl with leukemia in remission who has large carious lesions in three primary teeth	*routine office treatment*	22.2	21.0	12.5	15.3	15.6
		*after consultation with specialist**	63.5	65.4	56.8	59.7	55.6
		only in a hospital	3.2	8.6	12.5	9.7	6.7
		refer to dental specialist	9.5	2.5	14.8	9.7	17.8
8.	A moderately retarded, cerebral-palsied 13-year-old boy with a dentoalveolar abscess	*routine office treatment**	36.5	45.7	43.2	41.7	46.7
		after consultation with specialist	39.7	28.4	28.4	30.6	28.9
		only in a hospital	4.8	8.6	10.2	5.6	4.4
		refer to dental specialist	19.0	13.6	15.9	20.8	15.6

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
9.	A 40-year-old edentulous woman with an unrepaired complete cleft of the hard and soft palates who is in need of a prosthesis	*routine office treatment*	6.3	4.9	5.7	4.2	2.2
		after consultation with specialist	14.3	12.3	22.7	6.9	16.7
		only in a hospital	-	-	1.1	1.4	2.2
		*refer to dental specialist**	79.4	81.5	67.0	84.7	74.4
10.	A 24-year-old moderately retarded man with controlled epilepsy and carious lesions in two molars	*routine office treatment**	73.0	83.9	70.4	65.3	70.0
		*after consultation with specialist**	23.8	13.6	26.1	29.2	23.3
		only in a hospital	-	-	-	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	1.6	1.2	1.1	4.2	2.2
11.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of gingivectomies	*routine office treatment*	17.5	6.2	9.1	6.9	11.1
		after consultation with specialist	14.3	16.0	11.4	13.9	16.7
		only in a hospital	36.5	40.7	36.4	26.4	21.1
		*refer to dental specialist**	30.2	33.3	40.9	51.4	45.6
12.	A 48-year-old woman with a prosthetic cardiac heart valve replacement who is in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	14.3	12.3	14.8	19.4	33.3
		*after consultation with specialist**	71.4	74.1	59.1	68.1	50.0
		only in a hospital	9.5	4.9	6.8	1.4	6.7
		refer to dental specialist	4.8	2.5	14.8	8.3	5.6
13.	A severely retarded 18-year-old in need of an apicoectomy	*routine office treatment*	11.1	6.2	7.9	6.9	11.1
		after consultation with specialist	4.8	13.6	14.8	5.6	15.6
		*only in a hospital**	47.6	45.7	25.0	29.2	17.8
		*refer to dental specialist**	36.5	29.6	46.6	55.6	51.1
14.	An 8-year-old autistic child with fractured Anterior teeth	*routine office treatment**	39.7	24.7	31.[illegible]	22.2	24.4
		after consultation with specialist	31.7	42.0	26.1	33.3	37.8
		only in a hospital	6.3	8.6	12.5	8.3	4.4
		refer to dental specialist	19.0	14.8	21.6	33.3	27.8
15.	A 6-year-old moderately retarded girl with a repaired cleft palate and dental caries	*routine office treatment**	65.1	67.9	60.2	56.9	61.1
		after consultation with specialist	23.8	18.5	21.6	23.6	26.7
		only in a hospital	1.6	2.5	3.4	1.4	1.1
		refer to dental specialist	7.9	7.4	12.5	16.7	[illegible].7
16.	A 56-year-old man with a history of two episodes of stroke who is in need of multiple extractions	*routine office treatment*	-	3.7	-	4.2	5.6
		after consultation with specialist	27.0	35.8	26.1	25.0	34.4
		*only in a hospital**	34.9	21.0	31.8	27.8	25.6
		*refer to dental specialist**	38.1	33.3	34.1	38.9	30.0
17.	A blind and deaf 6-year-old boy with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	31.7	39.5	36.4	36.1	41.1
		after consultation with specialist	28.6	28.4	27.3	22.2	31.1
		*only in a hospital**	11.1	7.4	7.9	8.3	5.6
		*refer to dental specialist**	27.0	21.0	25.0	30.6	17.8

	Description of Patient	Alternative Treatment	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
18.	A severely retarded 16-year-old in need of a pulp extirpation	*routine office treatment*	25.4	21.0	22.7	19.4	26.7
		after consultation with specialist	15.9	19.7	15.9	15.3	23.3
		*only in a hospital**	25.4	32.1	26.1	25.0	15.6
		*refer to dental specialist**	31.7	24.7	31.8	38.9	30.0
19.	A 16-year-old boy with muscular dystrophy and carious lesions in several teeth	*routine office treatment**	41.3	46.9	45.4	41.7	43.3
		after consultation with specialist	44.4	37.0	34.1	36.1	37.8
		only in a hospital	9.5	1.2	5.7	5.6	5.6
		refer to dental specialist	4.8	12.3	10.2	13.9	6.7
20.	An 18-year-old moderately retarded controlled epileptic with gingival hyperplasia	*routine office treatment*	68.2	39.5	42.0	33.3	53.3
		after consultation with specialist	17.5	38.3	32.9	36.1	32.2
		only in a hospital	1.6	7.4	4.5	4.2	-
		*refer to dental specialist**	12.7	11.1	14.8	23.6	7.8
21.	A 12-year-old girl with a recent history of rheumatic fever who is in need of an extraction	*routine office treatment*	31.7	25.9	36.4	33.3	40.0
		*after consultation with specialist**	63.5	64.2	52.3	56.9	45.6
		only in a hospital	1.6	3.7	4.5	1.4	3.3
		refer to dental specialist	3.2	3.7	4.5	5.6	5.6
22.	A 48-year-old woman with multiple sclerosis and gingival inflammation	*routine office treatment**	47.6	48.1	59.1	45.8	55.6
		after consultation with specialist	42.9	45.7	30.7	41.7	35.6
		only in a hospital	4.8	1.2	1.1	-	2.2
		refer to dental specialist	3.2	3.7	6.8	9.7	2.2
23.	A 60-year-old man in need of an obturator for a maxillary defect secondary to therapy for a squamous cell carcinoma of the hard palate	*routine office treatment*	1.6	1.2	6.8	2.8	1.1
		*after consultation with specialist**	12.7	7.4	12.5	9.7	7.8
		only in a hospital	-	-	2.3	1.4	-
		refer to dental specialist	85.7	90.1	76.1	83.3	86.7
24.	A 16-year-old hemophiliac with a badly decayed molar that must be extracted	*routine office treatment*	-	1.2	3.4	4.2	1.1
		after consultation with specialist	17.5	30.9	28.4	22.2	21.1
		*only in a hospital**	49.2	37.0	42.0	43.1	41.1
		refer to dental specialist	33.3	24.7	17.0	27.8	32.2
25.	An 18-year-old controlled diabetic in need of gingivoplasty	*routine office treatment**	68.2	55.6	55.7	44.4	54.4
		*after consultation with specialist**	28.6	38.3	29.5	37.5	26.7
		only in a hospital	-	-	2.3	-	-
		refer to dental specialist	3.2	6.2	6.8	15.3	14.4

* Alternatives selected by advisory committee. Total percentages may differ from 100 because of omissions and rounding error.

TABLE 7

Percentage of Students from All Schools Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	26.2	27.3	27.6	30.7	29.3
Professional partnership	20.5	17.6	17.8	19.9	14.9
Employed professional practice	16.2	15.0	13.5	15.2	16.5
Full-time residency or graduate training	14.8	15.5	19.9	22.7	24.7
Research and/or teaching	3.6	2.6	1.9	2.2	2.5
Military service	18.8	17.8	17.6	10.4	9.8
Other activities	7.4	8.0	5.2	4.1	3.6

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine	47.0	37.7	35.7	30.7	29.6
Other biological sciences	29.8	33.4	31.4	35.2	36.7
English	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.3
Mathematics	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.3	1.3
Physical science	2.7	2.9	3.5	4.5	4.3
Engineering	1.3	3.2	4.6	3.9	4.1
Psychology, sociology, or social work	6.5	5.8	7.1	6.8	6.0
Other social sciences	2.8	2.3	2.6	3.2	2.8
Other majors	6.1	8.1	8.1	7.5	8.0

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college	10.3	12.1	15.9	14.8	12.7
Between undergraduate college and dental school	17.1	23.0	27.6	28.5	30.1

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Military service	7.4	11.8	12.4	11.0	7.8
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.1
Handicapped person in family	6.8	6.6	9.7	11.4	8.5

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible		5.8	1.6	1.4	0.7
Treat only when required		49.7	51.3	48.4	46.6
Occasionally treated		32.1	32.4	38.1	42.1
Actively sought experiences		6.9	8.7	6.7	7.2

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

1974 and 1977, but dropped to 15 percent in 1978. Only two choices show clear trends. Full-time residency or graduate training increased from 15 percent in 1974 to about 25 percent in 1978, while military service declined from 19 percent in 1974 to 10 percent in 1978.

Predentistry or premedicine was the undergraduate major for nearly half of the 1974 graduates. Its popularity then declined steadily to just 30 percent for 1978 graduates. Over the same period, other biological sciences increased from 30 percent to 37 percent. The end of the military draft is a possible contributing factor here, since it released students from the pressure of making early vocational commitments.

Around 10 percent each year had an undergraduate major in the social sciences. Ten percent or more of the students each year had a year or more of full-time work experience before entering undergraduate college. The number having full-time work experience between undergraduate college and dental school increased rather steadily from 17 percent in 1974 to 30 percent in 1978. The end of the draft and increasing tuition costs, both for undergraduate and dental schools, are quite likely contributing factors here.

The number who had had military service increased from seven percent in 1974 to 12 percent in 1976 and then declined to 8 percent in 1978. Fewer than one percent reported Peace Corps, VISTA, or similar service in any year.

The number reporting a handicapped person in the family ranged from seven percent in 1974 to 11 percent in 1977. In 1975 through 1978, a question was included on attitudes toward treating handicapped patients. In 1975, about six percent said they avoided such patients when possible. By 1978, this response was chosen by less than one percent. Close to 50 percent each year said they treated such patients only when they had to. The number who reported they occasionally treated such patients (voluntarily) increased from 32 percent in 1975 to 42 percent in 1978. Less than 10 percent each year said they actively sought such experiences. In these responses, there is clear confirmation that the Foundation's program had the desired effect upon substantial numbers of students and substantiates anecdotal evidence gathered in site visits during and after the funding period.

Data for individual schools are shown in Tables 7-1 through 7-11. With, of course, smaller numbers of students involved in each of these tables, substantial irregularity in results is to be expected. Hence, comment will be made only on those figures where there is marked departure from the overall pattern. At School 01, more students expected to go into solo professional practice and a larger number had majored in predentistry or premedicine.

At School 02, a considerably larger percentage expected to enter employed professional practice, and considerably fewer expected to enter military service. A much smaller percentage had majored in predentistry or premedicine, and more had majored in other biological sciences. A larger number reported that they had seen handicapped patients in addition to those covered by course requirements.

School 03 was represented only in 1974 and 1975.

At School 04, a particularly large percentage of students in 1974 expected to enter military service, and while this percentage declined in subsequent years, it was still considerably above the total group in 1978. The percentage of students who said they treated handicapped patients only when required decreased from 74 percent in 1975 to 44 per cent in 1978. There was a concomitant increase in those who reported treatment of handicapped patients in addition to those of course requirements.

TABLE 7-1

Percentage of Students from School One Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	35.8	37.5	36.2	30.8	33.9
Professional partnership	11.3	10.9	11.6	10.8	24.2
Employed professional practice	7.5	3.1	11.6	4.6	1.6
Full-time residency or graduate training	17.0	17.2	20.3	21.5	24.2
Research and/or teaching	5.7	4.7	2.9	4.6	-
Military service	22.6	20.3	20.3	24.6	9.7
Other activities	5.7	9.4	-	4.6	4.8

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors					
Predentistry or premedicine	56.6	62.5	47.8	44.6	50.0
Other biological sciences	24.5	17.2	20.3	30.8	29.0
English	-	3.1	1.4	1.5	-
Mathematics	3.8	4.7	4.3	1.5	1.6
Physical science	1.9	1.6	1.4	-	4.8
Engineering	3.8	-	8.7	3.1	3.2
Psychology, sociology, or social work	1.9	1.6	2.9	6.1	6.4
Other social sciences	3.8	-	5.8	4.6	-
Other majors	3.8	9.4	2.9	6.1	3.2

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period					
Before undergraduate college	13.2	7.8	5.8	9.2	17.7
Between undergraduate college and dental school	18.9	26.6	37.7	26.1	25.8

Background Characteristics

Characteristics					
Military service	15.1	12.5	14.5	15.4	9.7
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	2.9	-	-
Handicapped person in family	5.7	3.1	11.6	7.7	8.1

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude					
Avoid when possible		6.2	-	-	4.8
Treat only when required		45.3	53.6	36.9	48.4
Occasionally treated		37.5	42.0	61.5	40.3
Actively sought experiences		10.9	2.9	1.5	4.8

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-2

Percentage of Students from School Two Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	9.7	23.3	24.5	30.1	28.6
Professional partnership	21.0	25.6	21.4	19.3	8.3
Employed professional practice	38.7	24.4	16.3	29.0	32.1
Full-time residency or graduate training	24.2	18.6	20.4	19.3	17.9
Research and/or teaching	-	3.5	5.1	3.2	2.4
Military service	-	2.3	6.1	2.1	5.9
Other activities	8.1	10.5	10.2	5.4	3.6
Various Undergraduate Majors					
Majors					
Predentistry or premedicine	30.6	30.2	21.4	9.7	13.1
Other biological sciences	40.3	41.9	42.9	57.0	51.2
English	-	-	2.0	1.1	-
Mathematics	-	1.2	1.0	1.1	2.4
Physical science	3.2	4.6	3.1	8.6	10.7
Engineering	1.6	3.5	6.1	4.3	2.4
Psychology, sociology, or social work	14.5	7.0	7.1	4.3	5.9
Other social sciences	3.2	4.6	3.1	2.1	4.8
Other majors	6.4	4.6	11.2	7.5	4.8
One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**					
Time Period					
Before undergraduate college	4.8	16.3	22.4	14.0	8.3
Between undergraduate college and dental school	9.7	22.1	34.7	24.7	39.3
Background Characteristics					
Characteristics					
Military service	4.8	8.1	10.2	7.5	3.6
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	1.6	1.2	-	1.1	-
Handicapped person in family	9.7	3.5	11.2	14.0	9.5
Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients					
Attitude					
Avoid when possible		9.3	2.0	1.1	-
Treat only when required		36.0	51.0	38.7	33.3
Occasionally treated		45.3	36.7	49.5	52.4
Actively sought experiences		8.1	9.2	9.7	9.5

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-3

Percentage of Students from School Three Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976***	1977***	1978***
Self-employed professional practice	20.0	24.3			
Professional partnership	31.4	8.1			
Employed professional practice	11.4	32.4			
Full-time residency or graduate training	17.1	13.5			
Research and/or teaching	2.9	-			
Military service	14.3	18.9			
Other activities	8.6	8.1			
Various Undergraduate Majors					
Majors					
Predentistry or premedicine	51.4	51.3			
Other biological sciences	25.7	32.4			
English	-	2.7			
Mathematics	-	-			
Physical science	2.9	2.7			
Engineering	2.9	18.8			
Psychology, sociology, or social work	5.7				
Other social sciences	2.9	-			
Other majors	8.6	-			
One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**					
Time Period					
Before undergraduate college	5.7	10.8			
Between undergraduate college and dental school	8.6	32.4			
Background Characteristics					
Characteristics					
Military service	2.9	16.2			
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-			
Handicapped person in family	-	8.1			
Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients					
Attitude					
Avoid when possible		27.0			
Treat only when required		21.6			
Occasionally treated		40.5			
Actively sought experiences		2.7			

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

***Data not available for this year

TABLE 7-4

Percentage of Students from School Four Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977***	1978
Self-employed professional practice	8.7	13.2	29.5		24.6
Professional partnership	13.0	13.2	17.0		17.2
Employed professional practice	21.7	15.1	10.7		11.5
Full-time residency or graduate training	17.4	23.6	18.7		24.6
Research and/or teaching	-	-	-		0.8
Military service	43.5	31.1	25.9		19.7
Other activities	8.7	6.6	1.8		2.5
Various Undergraduate Majors					
Majors					
Predentistry or premedicine	21.7	27.4	33.9		17.2
Other biological sciences	39.1	40.6	35.7		45.1
English	4.3	-	0.9		1.6
Mathematics	-	1.9	3.6		0.8
Physical science	4.3	2.8	1.8		1.6
Engineering	-	4.7	5.4		4.9
Psychology, sociology, or social work	13.0	12.3	8.9		9.8
Other social sciences	-	3.8	-		4.1
Other majors	8.7	6.6	9.8		8.2
One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**					
Time Period					
Before undergraduate college	4.3	7.5	18.7		13.1
Between undergraduate college and dental school	21.7	20.7	25.0		35.2
Background Characteristics					
Characteristics					
Military service	4.3	13.2	14.3		12.3
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	-		-
Handicapped person in family	13.0	7.5	8.0		9.8
Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients					
Attitude					
Avoid when possible		-	0.9		-
Treat only when required		73.6	52.7		44.3
Occasionally treated		17.0	40.2		44.3
Actively sought experiences		9.4	5.4		9.8

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

***Data not available for this year.

Fewer School 05 students expected to enter full-time residency or graduate training in comparison with the total group, and a consistently larger percentage in each year expected to enter employed professional practice. School 05 students were also well above the total group in the percentage reporting that they treated handicapped patients only when required to. However, almost none said they avoided such patients.

School 06 was represented in 1974 through 1977 only. In 1975, the percentage who reported they avoided treating handicapped people was considerably higher than for the total group, although this declined substantially by 1977. The percentage who did not answer this question at all was also substantially higher than that for the total group, particularly in 1976 and 1977.

A greater proportion of School 07 students expect to enter solo practice than was true for the total group. A substantially higher percentage had predentistry or premedicine undergraduate majors. The percentage saying they avoided treating handicapped patients was also higher than for the total group, but did show a decline between 1975 and 1978.

School 08 had a considerably larger percentage of students who expected to enter full-time residency or graduate training than the total group did and a considerably smaller number expecting to enter practice, either solo or in partnership.

Only one student said he avoided treating handicapped patients, but there were also a somewhat smaller percentage who said they treated more such patients than the course requirements necessitated. In 1978, about a fourth of the students did not answer the question on treatment of handicapped patients.

Data were available for School 09 only in 1976, 1977, and 1978. Here again, an unusually small percentage of students expected to enter private

TABLE 7-5

Percentage of Students from School Five Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	Years 1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	30.3	26.4	28.8	29.6	25.2
Professional partnership	19.1	20.8	22.9	26.5	20.0
Employed professional practice	20.2	21.6	24.6	20.4	25.2
Full-time residency or graduate training	4.5	13.6	4.2	17.3	13.0
Research and/or teaching	10.1	8.0	1.7	4.1	6.1
Military service	16.8	11.2	10.2	7.1	11.3
Other activities	9.0	9.6	10.2	3.1	5.2

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine	40.4	36.8	44.1	37.8	29.6
Other biological sciences	33.7	34.4	24.6	34.7	29.6
English	3.4	0.8	0.8	1.0	3.5
Mathematics	2.2	3.2	0.8	2.0	0.9
Physical science	1.1	1.6	2.5	3.1	2.6
Engineering	-	4.0	3.4	4.1	6.1
Psychology, sociology, or social work	7.9	6.4	7.6	4.1	3.5
Other social sciences	3.4	4.0	2.5	4.1	2.6
Other majors	7.9	5.6	9.3	7.1	14.8

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college	10.1	11.2	16.1	19.4	13.9
Between undergraduate college and dental school	15.7	19.2	22.0	22.4	21.7

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Military service	7.9	6.4	15.2	10.2	7.8
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	1.6	1.7	-	-
Handicapped person in family	5.6	10.4	9.3	12.2	6.1

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible		0.8	-	-	-
Treat only when required		62.4	57.6	70.4	58.3
Occasionally treated		23.2	34.7	24.5	33.0
Actively sought experiences		6.4	6.8	5.1	5.2

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-6

Percentage of Students from School Six Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978***
Self-employed professional practice	38.4	24.8	30.8	41.7	
Professional partnership	20.5	30.1	40.0	41.7	
Employed professional practice	12.3	13.3	12.3	4.7	
Full-time residency or graduate training	9.6	11.5	11.5	7.1	
Research and/or teaching	2.7	0.9	1.5	-	
Military service	21.9	14.2	6.1	7.0	
Other activities	6.8	4.4	4.6	4.8	

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978***
Predentistry or premedicine	52.0	30.1	33.1	19.0	
Other biological sciences	20.5	31.0	31.5	35.7	
English	1.4	-	1.5	-	
Mathematics	8.2	1.8	2.3	3.6	
Physical science	2.7	5.3	2.3	6.0	
Engineering	1.4	2.6	1.5	2.4	
Psychology, sociology, or social work	2.7	7.1	8.5	14.3	
Other social sciences	1.4	1.8	4.6	4.8	
Other majors	6.8	8.8	12.3	8.3	

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978***
Before undergraduate college	9.6	8.8	17.7	13.1	
Between undergraduate college and dental school	17.8	20.3	29.2	30.9	

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978***
Military service	6.8	9.7	10.0	20.2	
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	0.8	2.4	
Handicapped person in family	8.2	6.2	10.8	10.7	

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978***
Avoid when possible		11.5	6.1	1.2	
Treat only when required		56.6	37.7	41.7	
Occasionally treated		12.4	10.0	14.3	
Actively sought experiences		2.6	13.8	8.3	

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

***No data available for this year.

TABLE 7-7

Percentage of Students from School Seven Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	Years 1974	 1975	 1976	 1977	 1978
Self-employed professional practice	33.3	42.5	45.3	39.5	56.1
Professional partnership	27.8	12.8	11.3	15.8	14.6
Employed professional practice	11.1	12.8	3.8	7.9	4.9
Full-time residency or graduate training	9.3	8.5	9.4	15.8	12.2
Research and/or teaching	-	-	-	2.6	-
Military service	20.4	17.0	30.2	13.2	14.6
Other activities	-	4.3	1.9	2.6	2.4

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine	72.2	44.7	52.8	34.2	41.5
Other biological sciences	20.4	27.7	28.3	28.9	31.7
English	-	2.1	-	2.6	-
Mathematics	-	4.3	3.8	2.6	-
Physical science	1.8	2.1	5.7	2.6	4.9
Engineering	-	-	3.8	5.3	4.9
Psychology, sociology, or social work	1.8	-	-	2.6	2.4
Other social sciences	3.7	-	-	-	-
Other majors	-	12.8	5.7	7.9	12.2

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college	9.3	8.5	17.0	13.2	7.3
Between undergraduate college and dental school	5.6	19.1	28.3	23.7	29.3

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Military service	5.6	12.8	24.5	10.5	17.1
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	-	-	-
Handicapped person in family	1.8	6.4	7.5	18.4	2.4

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible		8.5	1.9	5.3	2.4
Treat only when required		36.2	66.0	44.7	48.8
Occasionally treated		40.4	30.2	34.2	41.5
Actively sought experiences		4.3	1.9	10.5	4.9

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-8

Percentage of Students from School Eight Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	5.9	-	2.6	13.3	-
Professional partnership	11.8	9.7	2.6	4.4	15.8
Employed professional practice	23.5	3.2	12.8	13.3	18.4
Full-time residency or graduate training	38.2	48.4	74.4	53.3	42.1
Research and/or teaching	-	6.4	-	2.2	2.6
Military service	11.8	16.1	5.1	13.3	5.3
Other activities	8.8	12.9	5.1	-	2.6

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine	41.2	45.2	35.9	33.3	28.9
Other biological sciences	29.4	22.6	25.6	28.9	18.4
English	-	6.4	-	6.7	2.6
Mathematics	-	-	-	2.2	-
Physical science	8.8	-	12.8	2.2	7.9
Engineering	2.9	3.[illegible]	7.7	6.7	5.3
Psychology, sociology, or social work	14.7	6.4	10.3	11.1	7.9
Other social sciences	-	-	-	-	-
Other majors	2.9	6.4	7.7	6.7	-

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college	11.8	12.9	7.7	15.6	-
Between undergraduate college and dental school	20.6	19.3	15.4	28.9	18.4

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Military service	5.9	6.4	2.6	4.4	-
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	-	-	-
Handicapped person in family	5.9	3.2	5.1	6.7	7.9

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible		-	-	-	2.6
Treat only when required		58.1	53.8	57.8	44.7
Occasionally treated		16.1	35.9	40.0	15.8
Actively sought experiences		22.6	7.7	2.2	13.2

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-9

Percentage of Students from School Nine Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	1974***	1975***	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice			12.0	12.4	16.0
Professional partnership			9.8	16.5	11.2
Employed professional practice			15.0	23.1	21.3
Full-time residency or graduate training			34.6	43.8	47.9
Research and/or teaching			3.0	1.6	3.5
Military service			28.6	6.6	4.1
Other activities			3.0	2.5	1.2

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974***	1975***	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine			33.8	39.7	31.4
Other biological sciences			24.8	25.6	36.1
English			-	-	0.6
Mathematics			2.3	3.3	2.4
Physical science			4.5	3.3	3.0
Engineering			3.8	4.1	3.0
Psychology, sociology, or social work			9.0	9.1	8.3
Other social sciences			4.5	4.1	5.3
Other majors			7.5	5.0	5.9

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974***	1975***	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college			15.0	10.7	10.6
Between undergraduate college and dental school			30.8	34.7	30.8

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974***	1975***	1976	1977	1978
Military service			6.0	3.3	4.1
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group			-	-	0.6
Handicapped person in family			14.3	5.8	6.5

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974***	1975***	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible			-	2.5	0.6
Treat only when required			56.4	58.7	59.8
Occasionally treated			26.3	28.9	32.5
Actively sought experiences			14.3	7.4	5.9

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

***Data not available for this year.

practice, solo or partnership, but a somewhat larger percentage expected to go into employed professional practice. The largest percentage of students said they expected to go into full-time residency or graduate training. The percentage reporting they treated handicapped patients only when required to was a little higher than for the total group.

The percentage of School 10 students who expected to enter self-employed professional practice rose from 20 percent in 1974 to 59 percent in 1978, while other categories declined concomitantly. An unusually high percentage reported full-time work experience between undergraduate college and dental school.

A somewhat higher percentage of School 10 students reported treating more handicapped patients than required than did the total group.

Proportionately more School 11 students expected to enter solo practice than was true for the total group. Thirty-five percent in 1974 expected to enter military service, but this declined to seven percent in 1978. In each of the four years, half or more of the students said they treated handicapped patients beyond the number required by the course.

National Board Examinations

Through the cooperation of the American Dental Association, some test items on dental care for the handicapped from the knowledge tests developed for this project were included in the December National Board Examinations in 1975, 1976, and 1978. Seventeen such items were included in 1975, eleven in 1976, and six in 1978. Table 8 shows the mean pass rate on these items for students from the funded schools and for all others.

It can be seen that the students from the funded schools did better than the others in all three years. The difference between the students from the funded schools and the others increased from year to year. Although the items

TABLE 7-10

Percentage of Students from School Ten Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

	Years				
Type of Activity	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	20.0	30.7	35.7	39.2	58.7
Professional partnership	20.0	14.8	10.0	20.3	9.3
Employed professional practice	10.0	11.9	11.4	6.8	2.7
Full-time residency or graduate training	25.0	8.9	11.4	13.5	9.3
Research and/or teaching	5.0	1.0	1.4	1.3	-
Military service	10.0	23.8	22.9	12.2	12.0
Other activities	15.0	12.9	7.1	6.8	8.0
Various Undergraduate Majors					
Majors					
Predentistry or premedicine	52.5	42.6	44.3	39.2	46.7
Other biological sciences	27.5	32.7	35.7	24.3	32.0
English	-	-	1.4	-	-
Mathematics	2.5	1.0	-	4.0	1.3
Physical science	-	2.0	1.4	2.7	1.3
Engineering	2.5	2.0	2.9	1.3	5.3
Psychology, sociology, or social work	5.0	4.0	5.7	5.4	1.3
Other social sciences	-	2.0	1.4	1.3	-
Other majors	10.0	11.9	4.3	13.5	9.3
One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**					
Time Period					
Before undergraduate college	15.0	16.8	15.7	14.9	12.0
Between undergraduate college and dental school	45.0	33.7	24.3	37.8	40.0
Background Characteristics					
Characteristics					
Military service	5.0	12.9	21.4	8.1	6.7
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	-	-	1.3	-
Handicapped person in family	5.0	6.9	5.7	10.8	17.3
Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients					
Attitude					
Avoid when possible		4.0	4.3	1.3	-
Treat only when required		44.5	58.6	39.2	46.7
Occasionally treated		45.5	31.4	52.7	49.3
Actively sought experiences		2.0	4.3	5.4	4.0

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 7-11

Percentage of Students from School Eleven Reporting Different Expected Professional Activities After Graduation*

Type of Activity	Years 1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Self-employed professional practice	33.3	45.7	32.9	48.6	38.9
Professional partnership	25.4	11.1	9.1	11.1	16.7
Employed professional practice	4.8	8.6	7.9	12.5	14.4
Full-time residency or graduate training	7.9	9.9	20.4	12.5	14.4
Research and/or teaching	3.2	1.2	1.1	-	3.3
Military service	34.9	23.5	21.6	18.1	6.7
Other activities	6.3	2.5	5.7	5.6	4.4

Various Undergraduate Majors

Majors	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Predentistry or premedicine	42.9	32.1	22.7	22.2	25.6
Other biological sciences	38.1	38.3	42.0	45.8	41.1
English	-	-	-	-	2.2
Mathematics	-	-	1.1	-	-
Physical science	3.2	3.7	5.7	9.7	6.7
Engineering	-	2.5	6.8	5.6	3.3
Psychology, sociology, or social work	3.2	4.9	6.8	2.8	4.4
Other social sciences	6.3	1.2	1.1	4.2	1.1
Other majors	6.3	12.3	4.5	6.9	10.0

One Year or More of Full-Time Work Experience**

Time Period	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Before undergraduate college	15.9	19.7	14.8	23.6	23.3
Between undergraduate college and dental school	17.5	19.7	22.7	23.6	24.4

Background Characteristics

Characteristics	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Military service	11.1	22.2	10.2	22.2	11.1
Peace Corps, VISTA, or other group	-	1.2	2.3	2.8	-
Handicapped person in family	12.7	6.2	6.8	20.8	8.9

Attitudes Toward Treating Handicapped Patients

Attitude	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Avoid when possible		2.5	-	2.8	-
Treat only when required		30.9	36.4	37.5	21.1
Occasionally treated		55.6	50.0	50.0	65.6
Actively sought experiences		9.9	11.4	8.3	8.9

* This question allowed for multiple response, total percentages will be greater than 100%.

**Because these were asked as separate questions, percentages will not equal 100%.

TABLE 8

Mean Pass Rates for Items on Care of Handicapped in National Board Examinations

	1975		1976		1978	
	Students from Funded Schools	Students from Other Schools	Students from Funded Schools	Students from Other Schools	Students from Funded Schools	Students from Other Schools
Mean Correct	62.7	61.4	64.1	60.7	74.7	67.9
N	463	2236	457	2126	468	2451

have not been equated for difficulty it does appear that the 1978 graduates from the funded schools, who would have had four years in the program, had considerably greater knowledge in this area than did those from other schools, and probably more than either group had three years earlier.

Discussion and Conclusions

There were difficulties in obtaining data from some schools that had not been expected when the project was planned, and for different reasons, some schools are not represented in one or more years. This makes any inferences drawn from the data necessarily much more tentative than they would be otherwise.

Nevertheless, it does seem possible to draw some fairly firm conclusions from the available data.

First, students at the end of the funding period had more factual knowledge of dentistry for the handicapped than did students before or in the early part of the funding period.

Second, student exposure to patients with handicapping conditions increased substantially during the funding period.

Third, there was an increase in student confidence in their ability to treat patients with handicapping conditions, and in their willingness to attempt such treatment.

These measured effects substantiate the anecdotal evidence gathered during the site visits that the program was generally well received by faculty and students. Overall, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's objectives in funding a program for training dentists in the care of the handicapped appear to have been accomplished.

SECTION II: FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES AFTER TWO YEARS IN PRACTICE

Procedure

The Foundation's purpose in initiating the funding program was to increase the availability of dental care for the handicapped. Thus, there was considerable interest in finding out the extent to which graduates of the funded programs were treating patients with handicapping conditions. To obtain this information, the 1974, 1976 and 1978 graduates of the 11 funded schools were followed-up by mail questionnaires two years after graduation, in 1976, 1978, and 1980 respectively. 1) These funded schools were: Columbia, New York University, University of Alabama, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Kentucky, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Nebraska, University of Tennessee, and University of Washington. The 1976 and 1978 graduates of 10 schools which did not receive funding were similarly surveyed. 2) These non-funded schools were: Louisiana State University, New Jersey Dental School, Tufts, University of Connecticut, University of Florida, University of Illinois, University of North Carolina, University of Oregon, University of the Pacific and University of Southern California. The initial mailings in 1976 and 1978 were accompanied by a covering letter signed by the president of the American Fund for Dental Health, on the fund's letterhead. In 1980, the covering letter was on American Dental Association stationery, and was signed by its president.

Approximately four weeks after the initial mailing, those who had not responded were sent a second copy of the questionnaire with a covering letter on Educational Testing Service letterhead signed by one of the project staff. In 1980, those who did not respond to the second mailing were called on the telephone, if a number could be found, and this was followed by a third mailing.

With these procedures, the response rate was slightly over 70 percent in 1976. In 1978 it was 62 percent for the funded schools and 55 percent for the non-funded schools. In 1980, the return rate was 76 percent for the funded schools and 73 percent for the non-funded schools.* Copies of the questionnaires used are shown in Appendix A.

Survey Results

Table 9 shows the results of the three surveys for the funded and non-funded schools separately. For both the funded and the non-funded schools, there is a clear increase in office treatment from the earlier to the later years. For all but two of the handicapping conditions, more of the 1978 graduates than of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools reported office treatment of such patients. For 23 out of the 37 conditions, more of the 1978 graduates than of the 1976 graduates of the funded schools reported office treatment. Similarly for 30 of the handicapping conditions, more of the 1978 graduates than of the 1976 graduates of the non-funded schools reported office treatment.

In comparing the data from the funded and the non-funded schools, more 1976 graduates of funded schools than of non-funded schools reported office treatment for 23 handicapping conditions. For the 1978 graduates, however, there was a considerable reversal. More graduates of non-funded schools than of funded schools reported office treatment for 20 of the 37 listed handicapping conditions.

---

*A misunderstanding resulted in the American Dental Association furnishing lists of only those 1978 graduates who had joined the association, rather than of all graduates, as had been done for the two prior surveys.

In-school exposure to dental care for the handicapped as reported by the 1976 and 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools is quite similar to that reported by the 1974 graduates of the funded schools. The 1976 and 1978 graduates of the funded schools report considerably more exposure, both didactic and clinical than did the 1974 graduates. More than 90 percent of the 1978 graduates of the funded schools had one or more specific courses on handicapped problems, where only slightly more than half of the 1974 graduates did. Similarly more than 70 percent of the 1978 graduates had treated, as a student, two or more handicapped patient, compared to 43 percent of the 1974 graduates.

There is a clear difference between the graduates of the funded schools, and those of the non-funded schools as to how their school experience affected their interest in treating the handicapped. More than half of those from the funded schools said they became more interested, compared with only 30 percent of those from non-funded schools. However, more than a third of those from the non-funded schools said they had already been interested, while only about one-fourth of those from the funded schools made this response.

A very small percentage of graduates from both the funded and non-funded schools reported that they generally avoided treating handicapped patients, while a somewhat larger percentage, in both categories, said that they had actively sought out opportunities to treat handicapped patients. The overwhelming majority said that they treated handicapped patients when they appeared.

Several questions were added to the 1978 questionnaire at the suggestion of the Foundation and the advisory committee. Very similar responses were made by graduates of both funded and non-funded schools. In both categories, 23 percent said they had made modifications to their offices for the handicapped,

TABLE 9

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY RESPONSES FOR GRADUATES OF FUNDED AND NON-FUNDED SCHOOLS, BY YEAR

Percentage of Dentists who reported treating one or more patients with the following conditions in their office

		Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
		1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
1.	Mental retardation	55	63	62	56	60
2.	Cerebral palsy	20	27	31	21	26
3.	Blindness	25	33	35	33	33
4.	Deafness	41	45	50	48	52
5.	Epilepsy	68	74	72	70	79
6.	Stroke	42	51	50	49	55
7.	Parkinsonism	24	29	30	30	37
8.	Arthritis	73	78	80	73	82
9.	Poliomyelitis	18	15	15	14	15
10.	Spinal cord injuries	16	18	22	17	19
11.	Multiple sclerosis	17	15	26	14	22
12.	Muscular dystrophy	7	12	13	10	12
13.	Facial trauma from accidents	58	62	61	59	62
14.	Multiply-handicapped	22	27	29	19	26
15.	The home-bound patient	11	15	16	18	17
16.	The nursing-home patient	34	31	35	36	39
17.	Cleft palate	32	39	33	36	35
18.	Other craniofacial anomalies	10	14	13	13	14
19.	Spina bifida	3	6	4	3	4
20.	Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations	2	2	3	2	2
21.	Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances	86	87	87	85	88
22.	Hemophilia	14	16	16	14	20
23.	Cardiopulmonary disease	76	77	79	72	81
24.	Asthma	80	79	83	81	84
25.	Atherosclerosis	49	52	62	47	65
26.	Emphysema	51	53	57	49	58
27.	Cystic fibrosis	4	4	7	4	8
28.	Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	64	63	66	60	69
29.	Autism	3	5	5	5	4
30.	Hyperactivity	48	51	47	49	48
31.	Other behavior problems	41	39	52	41	53
32.	Leukemia	11	14	17	16	20
33.	Other blood dyscrasias	22	19	23	19	29
34.	Brain tumors	10	13	15	13	12
35.	Sarcomas	9	8	11	8	10
36.	Squamous cell carcinoma	17	19	18	17	18
37.	Other neoplasms	26	30	31	29	35
	N =	493	508	603	458	436

TABLE 9
(Continued)

Percentage of Dentists who reported in-school exposure to Dental Care for the Handicapped

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
Course Work:					
None at all	4	1	0	5	3
Some mention in passing	42	10	6	47	40
Perhaps one specific course	35	42	44	27	36
Several specific courses	19	46	49	19	19
Clinical experience:					
None at all	19	4	3	26	21
Exposed to one or more conditions but did not treat	19	6	6	20	17
Treated a handicapped patient	17	19	16	17	25
Treated two or more handicapped patients	43	70	74	34	33

Percentage of Dentists who report their attitude toward treating handicapped in relation to their school experience

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
Became more interested in treating handicapped		60	57	30	30
Became less interested in treating handicapped	(not comparable)	2	3	3	4
Was already interested in treating handicapped		19	28	33	39
Remained uninterested in treating the handicapped		4	6	11	14
Other		13	4	4	9

Percentage of Dentists who reported on their efforts to treat the handicapped

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
Actively sought out opportunities to treat the handicapped	7	11	13	13	10
Treated handicapped patients when they appeared	88	83	84	82	85
Generally avoided treating Handicapped patients	3	2	1	3	3

TABLE 9
(Continued)

	Funded Schools 1978	Non-Funded Schools 1978
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?		
Yes	23	23
No	59	58
Modifications:		
Outside entrance	16	17
Interior doors	13	11
Bathroom facilities	12	12
Provided special equipment	1	2
Operatory	5	4
X-ray facilities	2	3
Other	2	2
Not in private practice	17	21
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?		
None	75	78
Incidental with one or more	19	14
Close working relations with one	3	4
Close working relations with two or more	2	2
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?		
Yes	1	0
No	99	99
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?		
Yes	6	6
No	93	93
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?		
Yes	24	22
No	75	77
If yes, did you		
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?	15	12
Have one or more short course or workshop?	5	4
Do informal reading and study?	9	8
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?		
None	23	22
A few consultations about selected patients	65	65
Frequent consultations about many patients	12	12

quite a few noting that this was required by the government. About six percent from both groups had close working relations with one or more organizations for the handicapped. About 20 percent of graduates from funded schools had incidental relations with such organizations, and a slightly smaller percentage of graduates of non-funded schools had such relations.

Very few in either group had joined the Academy of Dentistry for the Handicapped. A number commented that they hadn't heard of it, but would be interested in joining.

Six percent of both groups had been a consultant to a group representing the handicapped. A little more than 20 percent of both groups had had some kind of additional education on dentistry for the handicapped, subsequent to completion of dental school. Concerning consultations with medical experts about handicapped patients, both groups gave almost identical patterns. Twelve percent reported frequent consultation about many patients, and sixty-five percent had had a few consultations.

Tables giving data for each of the funded schools separately are shown in Appendix B, Tables B-1 through B-11.

These survey results show that: handicapping conditions became less of a barrier to dental treatment during the period 1976 to 1980. The 1978 graduates of the funded schools reported treating more categories of handicapped patients than had the 1974 graduates. However, the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools reported treating as many categories also. It should be noted that the response rate for 1978 graduates of non-funded schools was a little lower than for graduates of funded schools, and considerably lower for the 1976 graduates. It is quite possible that those who were treating handicapped patients were more apt to respond than those that did not, and that this tended to reduce apparent differences between the graduates of funded schools and those of non-funded schools. However, it appears that many forces besides the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation funding program acted to increase the willingness of both groups of graduates to accept handicapped patients.

The data also confirm the observation from site visits that the schools did indeed increase both didactic and clinical exposure to handicapping problems. This is highlighted in Table 10. Of 1974 graduates from funded schools, 19 percent reported that they had had several specific courses while 4 percent had no such course at all. Of 1978 graduates, in contrast, 49 percent reported having several courses and none said they had not had such a course. Of 1978 graduates of non-funded schools, three percent reported no courses on dentistry for the handicapped, and 19 percent reported having several courses.

Concerning clinical experience, 19 percent of 1974 graduates of funded schools said they had not treated any handicapped patients, while 43 percent reported treating two or more handicapped patients. Of 1978 graduates, only three percent reported no clinical experience with handicapped patients, and 74 percent said they had treated two or more such patients. In comparison, 21 percent of 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools reported no clinical experience with handicapped patients, while 33 percent had treated two or more.

Table 11 compares graduates of funded and non-funded schools concerning interest in treating the handicapped. More than half of the graduates of the funded schools in both 1976 and 1978 said that they had become more interested in treating the handicapped. About one quarter in each year said they had already been interested.

Table 10

Percent of dentists who reported selected in-school exposure to dental care for the handicapped by year of graduation

	Funded Schools			Non-funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
N =	493	588	603	458	436
Course Work					
None at all	4	1	0	5	3
Several specific courses	19	46	49	19	19
Clinical Experience					
None at all	19	4	3	26	21
Treated 2 or more	43	70	74	34	33

Table 11

Percent of dentists who reported that they became "more interested" in treating handicapped and those reporting "already interested" for funded and non-funded schools, by year of graduation

	1976			1978		
	N	Became more interested	Already interested	N	Became more interested	Already interested
Funded schools	588	53	25	603	58	28
Non-funded schools	458	30	35	436	33	37

142

The graduates of the non-funded schools presented a different picture. About a third of the graduates in both 1976 and 1978 said that they became more interested, and another third said that they were already interested.

These differences probably reflect the fact that at the funded schools, denistry for the handicapped was a highly visible special project.

Table 12 explores the number of different handicapping conditions treated in the office by graduates of the funded and non-funded schools. About eight percent of the 1974 graduates from funded schools reported that they had treated 21 or more different handicapping conditions, compared with more than thirteen percent of the 1976 and 1978 graduate. About 20 percent of the 1974 and 1976 graduates of the funded schools reported treating between 16 and 20 conditions, compared with 26.5 percent of the 1978 graduates. Sixteen percent of the 1974 graduates from funded schools reported treating five or fewer conditions, compared with about 13 percent of the 1976 and 1978 graduates.

Graduates of the non-funded schools showed patterns very similar to those of the funded schools for the same year.

Table 13 shows similar data for treatment in either the office or a hospital. Thirty-eight percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools reported treating 16 or more different conditions. This percentage increased to 45 percent of the 1976 graduates and over 50 percent of the 1978 graduates. Fewer than 10 percent of the graduates in all three years reported treating 5 or fewer handicapping conditions.

Again, the graduates of the non-funded schools had patterns quite similar to those of the funded schools.

TABLE 12

Number of Different Handicapping Conditions Treated in Office by Graduates of Funded and Non-Funded Schools, in Per Cent

Number of Handicapping Conditions Treated	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
	N=493	N=588	N=603	N=458	N=436
21 +	7.9	13.3	13.3	12.5	15.6
16 - 20	19.5	20.4	26.5	17.0	25.0
11 - 15	35.7	30.3	29.0	31.7	31.7
6 - 10	20.9	22.3	18.9	22.7	17.4
1 - 5	10.3	7.5	6.8	9.8	4.6
0	5.7	6.3	5.5	6.3	5.7

TABLE 13

Number of Different Handicapping Conditions Treated in Office or Hospital by Graduates of Funded and Non-Funded Schools, in Per Cent

Number of Handicapping Conditions Treated	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
	N=493	N=588	N=603	N=458	N=436
21 +	16.6	21.4	23.1	21.4	23.4
16 - 20	21.3	23.5	28.9	18.6	25.7
11 - 15	38.3	27.9	26.5	30.8	30.3
6 - 10	16.4	19.6	14.9	21.0	14.2
1 - 5	7.1	5.6	5.3	7.6	3.7
0	0.2	2.0	1.3	0.7	2.8

Relationship Between Knowledge Test Scores and the Care of Handicapped Patients

Scores on the test of knowledge of dental treatment of the handicapped given before graduation were compared with the treatment of the 37 handicapping conditions reported later by graduates. It was, of course, possible to have multiple responses in reporting treatment of a particular handicap. Thus, for example, a dentist with three patients who were mentally retarded might have treated one in the office, treated the second in the hospital, and referred the third. Since the thrust of the Foundation's effort was to make regular office treatment available to the handicapped as much as possible, this analysis considers the responses "treat in hospital" and "referred" only if the graduate had not marked "treat in office". However, an analysis, not presented here, which considred all responses yielded substantially the same picture.

Table 14 shows the mean test score for each of the treatment responses given by the 1974 graduates for the 37 handicapping conditions. It will be noted that the mean test scores of those who responded, about 101, is slightly above the mean score of 100, for all those who took the test in 1974. This is consistent with the findings of other studies that the better students are more likely to participate in follow-uup studies.

The most notable feature of this table is the high test scores of those who report hospital treatment. For 29 of the 37 handicapping conditions, the mean test score of those reporting such treatment was higher than for any other category. Hospital admission privileges ordinarily go to the better students, so this finding does not seem surprising.

For thirteen of the handicapping conditions, those who reported "office treatment" had higher mean scores than those who reported "no contact", while the reverse was true for the other 24 conditions. The differences in most instances were quite small.

TABLE 14

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MENTAL RETARDATION	N	113	11	3	55	182
	ROW%	62.09%	6.04%	1.65%	30.22%	100.00%
	COL%	4.73%	4.33%	4.17%	1.43%	2.77%
	MEAN	100.61	104.05	103.82	100.99	100.98
	S.D.	8.89	11.21	9.56	9.26	9.22
	MIN	75.59	76.82	92.78	79.27	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	116.10	118.56	122.24
CEREBRAL PALSY	N	44	5	4	123	176
	ROW%	25.00%	2.84%	2.27%	69.89%	100.00%
	COL%	1.84%	1.97%	5.56%	3.19%	2.68%
	MEAN	99.53	101.12	102.29	101.57	101.06
	S.D.	7.23	12.98	11.50	9.33	9.08
	MIN	79.27	76.82	85.41	79.27	76.82
	MAX	117.33	112.42	116.10	122.24	122.24
BLINDNESS	N	40	9	1	125	175
	ROW%	22.86%	5.14%	0.57%	71.43%	100.00%
	COL%	1.67%	3.54%	1.39%	3.25%	2.67%
	MEAN	99.56	106.83	100.14	101.18	101.10
	S.D.	8.13	7.14	0.0	9.11	8.91
	MIN	85.41	94.00	100.14	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	117.33	100.14	122.24	122.24
DEAFNESS	N	85	10	1	87	183
	ROW%	46.45%	5.46%	0.55%	47.54%	100.00%
	COL%	3.56%	3.94%	1.39%	2.26%	2.79%
	MEAN	100.58	103.21	102.60	100.88	100.87
	S.D.	9.29	11.28	0.0	8.68	9.12
	MIN	75.59	76.82	102.60	81.73	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	102.60	118.56	122.24
EPILEPSY	N	138	6	0	35	179
	ROW%	77.09%	3.35%	0.0 %	19.55%	100.00%
	COL%	5.78%	2.36%	0.0 %	0.91%	2.73%
	MEAN	100.35	102.80	0.0	103.44	101.03
	S.D.	9.11	13.66	0.0	8.71	9.31
	MIN	75.59	76.82	0.0	81.73	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	0.0	118.56	122.24

TABLE 14 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
STROKE	N	88	8	1	87	184
	ROW%	47.83%	4.35%	0.54%	47.28%	100.00%
	COL%	3.68%	3.15%	1.39%	2.26%	2.80%
	MEAN	101.41	107.66	87.86	100.61	101.23
	S.D.	8.98	7.75	0.0	8.98	9.07
	MIN	75.59	96.46	87.86	79.27	75.59
	MAX	118.56	118.56	87.86	122.24	122.24
PARKINSONISM	N	48	4	1	126	179
	ROW%	26.82%	2.23%	0.56%	70.39%	100.00%
	COL%	2.01%	1.57%	1.39%	3.27%	2.73%
	MEAN	101.55	104.13	94.00	100.88	101.10
	S.D.	8.74	15.99	0.0	8.86	9.06
	MIN	79.27	76.82	94.00	79.27	76.82
	MAX	118.56	117.33	94.00	122.24	122.24
ARTHRITIS	N	144	7	0	34	185
	ROW%	77.84%	3.78%	0.0 %	18.38%	100.00%
	COL%	6.03%	2.76%	0.0 %	0.88%	2.82%
	MEAN	100.72	101.90	0.0	102.81	101.15
	S.D.	9.02	13.09	0.0	8.91	9.22
	MIN	75.59	76.82	0.0	81.73	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	0.0	118.56	122.24
POLIOMYELITIS	N	34	4	0	140	178
	ROW%	19.10%	2.25%	0.0 %	78.65%	100.00%
	COL%	1.42%	1.57%	0.0 %	3.64%	2.71%
	MEAN	100.58	111.80	0.0	101.04	101.20
	S.D.	8.54	3.63	0.0	8.90	8.90
	MIN	81.73	107.51	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	117.33	0.0	122.24	122.24
SPINAL CORD INJURIES	N	35	7	0	135	177
	ROW%	19.77%	3.95%	0.0 %	76.27%	100.00%
	COL%	1.47%	2.76%	0.0 %	3.51%	2.70%
	MEAN	101.79	106.98	0.0	100.62	101.11
	S.D.	8.55	7.21	0.0	8.85	8.83
	MIN	81.73	94.00	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	118.56	117.33	0.0	122.24	122.24

TABLE 14(continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS	N	32	10	0	135	177
	ROW%	18.08%	5.65%	0.0 %	76.27%	100.00%
	COL%	1.34%	3.94%	0.0 %	3.51%	2.70%
	MEAN	100.60	107.39	0.0	100.94	101.24
	S.D.	9.27	6.76	0.0	8.77	8.89
	MIN	79.27	98.91	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	118.56	0.0	122.24	122.24
MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY	N	12	7	0	157	176
	ROW%	6.82%	3.98%	0.0 %	89.20%	100.00%
	COL%	0.50%	2.76%	0.0 %	4.08%	2.68%
	MEAN	97.48	107.51	0.0	101.21	101.20
	S.D.	7.61	6.05	0.0	8.94	8.90
	MIN	85.41	98.91	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	111.19	117.33	0.0	122.24	122.24
FACIAL TRAUMA FROM ACCIDENTS	N	123	10	3	46	182
	ROW%	67.58%	5.49%	1.65%	25.27%	100.00%
	COL%	5.15%	3.94%	4.17%	1.19%	2.77%
	MEAN	101.36	101.00	103.42	99.87	101.00
	S.D.	8.95	9.57	8.64	9.65	9.19
	MIN	75.59	76.82	94.00	81.73	75.59
	MAX	118.56	112.42	114.87	122.24	122.24
MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED	N	44	8	2	120	174
	ROW%	25.29%	4.60%	1.15%	68.97%	100.00%
	COL%	1.84%	3.15%	2.78%	3.12%	2.65%
	MEAN	101.37	102.90	100.76	100.71	100.98
	S.D.	8.23	5.65	15.35	9.14	8.89
	MIN	87.86	94.00	85.41	79.27	79.27
	MAX	122.24	112.42	116.10	118.56	122.24
THE HOME-BOUND PATIENT	N	21	6	0	147	174
	ROW%	12.07%	3.45%	0.0 %	84.48%	100.00%
	COL%	0.88%	2.36%	0.0 %	3.82%	2.65%
	MEAN	100.84	103.42	0.0	101.09	101.14
	S.D.	9.03	6.93	0.0	9.03	8.98
	MIN	79.27	94.00	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	112.42	0.0	122.24	122.24

TABLE 14(continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATILNTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

HANDICAP		PATIENT MANAGEMENT TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
THE NURSING-HOME PATIENT	N	69	17	1	95	182
	ROW%	37.91%	9.34%	0.55%	52.20%	100.00%
	COL%	2.89%	6.69%	1.39%	2.47%	2.77%
	MEAN	101.19	100.65	108.74	100.81	100.98
	S.D.	8.69	9.21	0.0	9.53	9.18
	MIN	75.59	76.82	108.74	81.73	75.59
	MAX	116.10	116.10	108.74	122.24	122.24
CLEFT PALATE (AND CLEFT LIP)	N	61	6	6	108	181
	ROW%	33.70%	3.31%	3.3[illegible]	59.67%	100.00%
	COL%	2.55%	2.36%	8.33%	2.80%	2.76%
	MEAN	100.08	102.60	94.82	101.53	100.85
	S.D.	9.83	13.09	7.98	8.42	9.19
	MIN	75.59	76.82	85.41	79.27	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	109.96	118.56	122.24
OTHER CRANIOFACIAL ANOMALIES	N	21	9	8	135	173
	ROW%	12.14%	5.20%	4.62%	78.03%	100.00%
	COL%	0.88%	3.54%	11.11%	3.51%	2.63%
	MEAN	99.03	102.05	98.91	101.33	100.98
	S.D.	8.22	9.79	7.31	9.25	9.13
	MIN	87.86	76.82	87.86	79.27	76.82
	MAX	117.33	112.42	111.19	122.24	122.24
SPINA BIFIDA	N	6	6	0	163	175
	ROW%	3.43%	3.43%	0.0 %	93.14%	100.00%
	COL%	0.25%	2.36%	0.0 %	4.23%	2.67%
	MEAN	101.57	106.08	0.0	100.93	101.13
	S.D.	6.92	7.21	0.0	9.00	8.93
	MIN	86.64	94.00	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	107.51	113.65	0.0	122.24	122.24
THALIDOMIDE	N	5	2	0	167	174
	ROW%	2.87%	1.15%	0.0 %	95.98%	100.00%
	COL%	0.21%	0.79%	0.0 %	4.34%	2.65%
	MEAN	105.79	103.82	0.0	101.05	101.22
	S.D.	6.09	3.68	0.0	8.99	8.92
	MIN	97.69	100.14	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	114.87	107.51	0.0	122.24	122.24

TABLE 14 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
DIABETES	N	172	5	1	8	186
	ROW%	92.47%	2.69%	0.54%	4.30%	100.00%
	COL%	7.20%	1.97%	1.39%	0.21%	2.83%
	MEAN	100.96	107.02	97.69	104.44	101.26
	S.D.	9.03	4.15	0.0	9.71	9.02
	MIN	75.59	100.14	97.69	81.73	75.59
	MAX	122.24	112.42	97.69	116.10	122.24
HEMOPHILIA	N	29	11	10	125	175
	ROW%	16.57%	6.29%	5.71%	71.43%	100.00%
	COL%	1.21%	4.33%	13.89%	3.25%	2.67%
	MEAN	98.53	104.05	97.32	101.65	101.04
	S.D.	6.87	10.39	8.85	9.25	9.10
	MIN	84.18	76.82	85.41	79.27	76.82
	MAX	109.96	117.33	116.10	122.24	122.24
CARDIOPULMONARY DISEASE	N	149	8	3	21	181
	ROW%	82.32%	4.42%	1.66%	11.60%	100.00%
	COL%	6.24%	3.15%	4.17%	0.55%	2.76%
	MEAN	101.61	101.98	92.37	98.86	101.15
	S.D.	8.60	10.29	5.52	10.65	9.02
	MIN	79.27	76.82	87.86	79.27	76.82
	MAX	122.24	112.42	100.14	116.10	122.24
ASTHMA	N	155	5	0	24	184
	ROW%	84.24%	2.72%	0.0 %	13.04%	100.00%
	COL%	6.49%	1.97%	0.0 %	0.62%	2.80%
	MEAN	101.24	102.35	0.0	98.66	100.94
	S.D.	8.98	12.98	0.0	8.39	9.09
	MIN	75.59	76.82	0.0	81.73	75.59
	MAX	122.24	112.42	0.0	116.10	122.24
ATHEROSCLEROSIS	N	99	5	0	71	175
	ROW%	56.57%	2.86%	0.0 %	40.57%	100.00%
	COL%	4.14%	1.97%	0.0 %	1.84%	2.67%
	MEAN	100.82	101.12	0.0	101.08	100.93
	S.D.	8.98	12.84	0.0	9.20	9.21
	MIN	75.59	76.82	0.0	79.27	75.59
	MAX	118.56	112.42	0.0	122.24	122.24

TABLE 14 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREAT[illegible] OFFIC[illegible]	[illegible]ATM [illegible]SPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
EMPHYSEMA	N	104	7	0	67	178
	ROW%	58.43%	3.93%	0.0 %	37.64%	100.00%
	COL%	4.35%	2.76%	0.0 %	1.74%	2.71%
	MEAN	99.60	104.00	0.0	102.76	100.96
	S.D.	8.59	12.21	0.0	9.47	9.24
	MIN	75.59	76.82	0.0	79.27	75.59
	MAX	118.56	117.33	0.0	122.24	122.24
CYSTIC FIBROSIS	N	7	5	1	160	173
	ROW%	4.05%	2.89%	0.58%	92.49%	100.00%
	COL%	0.29%	1.97%	1.39%	4.15%	2.63%
	MEAN	104.53	107.51	96.46	100.86	101.18
	S.D.	9.02	4.11	0.0	8.80	8.79
	MIN	85.41	100.14	96.46	79.27	79.27
	MAX	112.42	112.42	96.46	122.24	122.24
ALLERGIC REACTION	N	133	6	2	40	181
	ROW%	73.48%	3.31%	1.10%	22.10%	100.00%
	COL%	5.57%	2.36%	2.78%	1.04%	2.76%
	MEAN	100.81	108.94	87.86	102.01	101.20
	S.D.	9.11	5.32	6.14	8.55	9.09
	MIN	75.59	100.14	81.73	84.18	75.59
	MAX	122.24	117.33	94.00	118.56	122.24
AUTISM	N	5	3	0	163	171
	ROW%	2.92%	1.75%	0.0 %	95.32%	100.00%
	COL%	0.21%	1.18%	0.0 %	4.23%	2.60%
	MEAN	102.11	98.91	0.0	101.03	101.02
	S.D.	4.57	15.75	0.0	9.04	9.11
	MIN	97.69	76.82	0.0	79.27	76.82
	MAX	109.96	112.42	0.0	122.24	122.24
HYPERACTIVITY	N	99	4	1	76	180
	ROW%	55.00%	2.22%	0.56%	42.22%	100.00%
	COL%	4.14%	1.57%	1.39%	1.97%	2.74%
	MEAN	100.80	98.30	85.41	101.93	101.14
	S.D.	8.50	14.28	0.0	9.63	9.24
	MIN	75.59	76.82	85.41	79.27	75.59
	MAX	122.24	112.42	85.41	118.56	122.24

TABLE 14 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
OTHER BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	N	83	4	5	75	167
	ROW%	49.70%	2.40%	2.99%	44.91%	100.00%
	COL%	3.47%	1.57%	6.94%	1.95%	2.54%
	MEAN	100.14	107.20	98.67	102.71	101.42
	S.D.	8.68	4.62	10.22	9.04	8.96
	MIN	79.27	100.14	85.41	79.27	79.27
	MAX	117.33	112.42	111.19	122.24	122.24
LEUKEMIA	N	22	8	0	145	175
	ROW%	12.57%	4.57%	0.0 %	82.86%	100.00%
	COL%	0.92%	3.15%	0.0 %	3.77%	2.67%
	MEAN	99.53	107.05	0.0	100.95	101.05
	S.D.	9.49	12.07	0.0	8.72	9.11
	MIN	84.18	76.82	0.0	79.27	76.82
	MAX	122.24	117.33	0.0	118.56	122.24
OTHER BLOOD DYSCRASIAS	N	43	4	2	120	169
	ROW%	25.44%	2.37%	1.18%	71.01%	100.00%
	COL%	1.80%	1.57%	2.78%	3.12%	2.57%
	MEAN	100.37	110.58	97.69	101.47	101.36
	S.D.	7.94	5.32	1.23	9.21	8.91
	MIN	84.18	102.60	96.46	79.27	79.27
	MAX	117.33	117.33	98.91	122.24	122.24
BRAIN TUMORS	N	27	4	0	144	175
	ROW%	15.43%	2.29%	0.0 %	82.29%	100.00%
	COL%	1.13%	1.57%	0.0 %	3.74%	2.67%
	MEAN	98.14	108.74	0.0	101.53	101.17
	S.D.	6.25	6.14	0.0	9.21	8.91
	MIN	81.73	100.14	0.0	79.27	79.27
	MAX	107.51	117.33	0.0	122.24	122.24
SARCOMAS	N	15	4	1	155	175
	ROW%	8.57%	2.29%	0.57%	88.57%	100.00%
	COL%	0.63%	1.57%	1.39%	4.02%	2.67%
	MEAN	102.27	111.80	100.14	100.80	101.17
	S.D.	8.34	3.63	0.0	8.91	8.91
	MIN	85.41	107.51	100.14	79.27	79.27
	MAX	113.65	117.33	100.14	122.24	122.24

TABLE 14 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1974 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA	N	34	12	6	127	179
	ROW%	18.99%	6.70%	3.35%	70.95%	100.00%
	COL%	1.42%	4.72%	8.33%	3.30%	2.73%
	MEAN	100.94	109.66	100.35	100.68	101.32
	S.D.	7.70	6.30	6.70	9.08	8.88
	MIN	87.86	96.46	90.32	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	118.56	106.28	122.24	122.24
OTHER NEOPLASM	N	50	7	9	110	176
	ROW%	28.41%	3.98%	5.11%	62.50%	100.00%
	COL%	2.09%	2.76%	12.50%	2.86%	2.68%
	MEAN	101.69	109.61	99.73	100.60	101.22
	S.D.	7.86	6.04	5.64	9.45	8.93
	MIN	81.73	101.37	86.64	79.27	79.27
	MAX	116.10	117.33	106.28	122.24	122.24

CHI-SQUARE= 2272.8232

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 15

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MENTAL RETARD-ATION	N	258	48	9	83	398
	ROW%	64.82%	12.06%	2.26%	20.85%	100.00%
	COL%	4.83%	4.66%	8.18%	1.07%	2.80%
	MEAN	102.51	103.36	97.76	102.99	102.60
	S.D.	8.27	7.52	9.75	7.58	8.12
	MIN	73.23	76.88	78.71	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	112.46	120.67	122.50
CEREBRAL PALSY	N	116	49	5	215	385
	ROW%	30.13%	12.73%	1.30%	55.84%	100.00%
	COL%	2.17%	4.75%	4.55%	2.78%	2.71%
	MEAN	103.32	103.37	107.35	102.01	102.65
	S.D.	7.50	6.95	6.39	8.62	8.12
	MIN	81.44	76.88	96.95	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	115.20	114.29	122.50	122.50
BLINDNESS	N	135	27	0	227	389
	ROW%	34.70%	6.94%	0.0 %	58.35%	100.00%
	COL%	2.53%	2.62%	0.0 %	2.94%	2.74%
	MEAN	102.88	103.00	0.0	102.44	102.63
	S.D.	8.30	7.95	0.0	8.01	8.11
	MIN	78.71	76.88	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	115.20	0.0	122.50	122.50
DEAFNESS	N	173	27	1	188	389
	ROW%	44.47%	6.94%	0.26%	48.33%	100.00%
	COL%	3.24%	2.62%	0.91%	2.43%	2.74%
	MEAN	102.88	104.72	96.95	102.04	102.59
	S.D.	8.19	8.17	0.0	8.18	8.21
	MIN	76.88	76.88	96.95	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	96.95	121.58	122.50
EPILEPSY	N	302	27	3	64	396
	ROW%	76.26%	6.82%	0.76%	16.16%	100.00%
	COL%	5.65%	2.62%	2.73%	0.83%	2.79%
	MEAN	102.71	102.66	99.99	101.73	102.52
	S.D.	7.98	7.65	3.44	8.93	8.11
	MIN	73.23	76.88	95.13	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	115.20	102.43	120.67	122.50

TABLE 15(continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
STROKE	N	217	34	3	137	391
	ROW%	55.50%	8.70%	0.77%	35.04%	100.00%
	COL%	4.06%	3.30%	2.73%	1.77%	2.75%
	MEAN	102.37	102.51	111.55	102.69	102.56
	S.D.	8.49	7.90	2.58	7.43	8.09
	MIN	69.58	76.88	109.72	78.71	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	115.20	122.50	122.50
PARKINSONISM	N	115	30	0	236	381
	ROW%	30.18%	7.87%	0.0 %	61.94%	100.00%
	COL%	2.15%	2.91%	0.0 %	3.06%	2.68%
	MEAN	102.89	103.76	0.0	102.41	102.66
	S.D.	9.05	7.74	0.0	7.72	8.16
	MIN	69.58	76.88	0.0	78.71	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	0.0	122.50	122.50
ARTHRITIS	N	321	23	0	56	400
	ROW%	80.25%	5.75%	0.0 %	14.00%	100.00%
	COL%	6.01%	2.23%	0.0 %	0.73%	2.82%
	MEAN	102.46	104.25	0.0	102.56	102.57
	S.D.	8.24	6.60	0.0	8.50	8.20
	MIN	69.58	94.21	0.0	73.23	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	0.0	120.67	122.50
POLIOMYELITIS	N	65	13	0	299	377
	ROW%	17.24%	3.45%	0.0 %	79.31%	100.00%
	COL%	1.22%	1.26%	0.0 %	3.87%	2.65%
	MEAN	103.04	105.30	0.0	102.54	102.72
	S.D.	7.05	6.03	0.0	8.48	8.19
	MIN	88.74	94.21	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	117.93	115.20	0.0	122.50	122.50
SPINAL CORD INJURIES	N	80	30	2	266	378
	ROW%	21.16%	7.94%	0.53%	70.37%	100.00%
	COL%	1.50%	2.91%	1.82%	3.44%	2.66%
	MEAN	103.19	104.55	102.88	102.41	102.75
	S.D.	7.56	9.64	0.46	8.16	8.17
	MIN	78.71	76.88	102.43	69.58	69.58
	MAX	117.93	122.50	103.34	122.50	122.50

TABLE 15 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS	N	66	28	0	287	381
	ROW%	17.32%	7.35%	0.0 %	75.33%	100.00%
	COL%	1.23%	2.72%	0.0 %	3.72%	2.68%
	MEAN	102.14	104.87	0.0	102.70	102.76
	S.D.	9.01	4.81	0.0	8.14	8.13
	MIN	73.23	94.21	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	113.37	0.0	122.50	122.50
MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY	N	52	15	1	307	375
	ROW%	13.87%	4.00%	0.27%	81.87%	100.00%
	COL%	0.97%	1.45%	0.91%	3.98%	2.64%
	MEAN	102.39	105.71	96.95	102.62	102.70
	S.D.	7.54	5.43	0.0	8.38	8.19
	MIN	78.71	94.21	96.95	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	115.20	96.95	122.50	122.50
FACIAL TRAUMA FROM ACCIDENTS	N	257	45	14	75	391
	ROW%	65.73%	11.51%	3.58%	19.18%	100.00%
	COL%	4.81%	4.36%	12.73%	0.97%	2.75%
	MEAN	102.76	103.58	102.95	101.22	102.57
	S.D.	8.20	7.83	9.06	7.67	8.12
	MIN	69.58	76.88	88.74	78.71	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	114.29	114.29	122.50
MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED	N	116	39	0	221	376
	ROW%	30.85%	10.37%	0.0 %	58.78%	100.00%
	COL%	2.17%	3.78%	0.0 %	2.86%	2.65%
	MEAN	102.21	103.62	0.0	102.50	102.53
	S.D.	8.92	8.54	0.0	7.62	8.15
	MIN	78.71	76.88	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	0.0	122.50	122.50
THE HOME-BOUND PATIENT	N	62	12	1	298	373
	ROW%	16.62%	3.22%	0.27%	79.89%	100.00%
	COL%	1.16%	1.16%	0.91%	3.86%	2.63%
	MEAN	101.73	103.11	91.48	102.80	102.61
	S.D.	8.69	6.41	0.0	7.99	8.09
	MIN	81.44	86.92	91.48	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	113.37	91.48	122.50	122.50

TABLE 15 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

HANDICAP		PATIENT MANAGEMENT TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
THE NURSING-HOME PATIENT	N	127	45	4	211	387
	ROW%	32.82%	11.63%	1.03%	54.52%	100.00%
	COL%	2.38%	4.36%	3.64%	2.73%	2.72%
	MEAN	102.71	104.37	97.86	102.34	102.65
	S.D.	7.9[illegible]	6.87	7.77	8.45	8.16
	MIN	81.44	86.92	89.65	69.58	69.58
	MAX	121.58	122.50	108.81	122.50	122.50
CLEFT PALATE (AND CLEFT LIP)	N	169	34	6	181	390
	ROW%	43.33%	8.72%	1.54%	46.41%	100.00%
	COL%	3.16%	3.30%	5.45%	2.34%	2.74%
	MEAN	102.65	104.57	105.62	102.32	102.71
	S.D.	7.86	8.49	7.57	8.22	8.11
	MIN	69.58	76.88	91.48	73.23	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	112.46	122.50	122.50
OTHER CRANIOFACIAL ANOMALIES	N	61	25	5	282	373
	ROW%	16.35%	6.70%	1.34%	75.60%	100.00%
	COL%	1.14%	2.42%	4.55%	3.65%	2.63%
	MEAN	105.16	105.24	108.08	101.72	102.60
	S.D.	6.98	6.94	3.07	8.34	8.15
	MIN	81.44	93.30	105.16	69.58	69.58
	MAX	117.02	118.85	113.37	122.50	122.50
SPINA BIFIDA	N	28	11	0	339	378
	ROW%	7.41%	2.91%	0.0 %	89.68%	100.00%
	COL%	0.52%	1.07%	0.0 %	4.39%	2.66%
	MEAN	103.11	106.99	0.0	102.62	102.78
	S.D.	6.67	5.60	0.0	8.29	8.14
	MIN	87.83	94.21	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	115.20	115.20	0.0	122.50	122.50
THALIDOMIDE	N	11	5	2	358	376
	ROW%	2.93%	1.33%	0.53%	95.21%	100.00%
	COL%	0.21%	0.48%	1.82%	4.64%	2.65%
	MEAN	104.50	104.43	112.46	102.64	102.77
	S.D.	4.30	6.25	0.0	8.24	8.15
	MIN	98.78	94.21	112.46	69.58	69.58
	MAX	112.46	111.55	112.46	122.50	122.50

158

TABLE 15 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
DIABETES	N	361	26	0	15	402
	ROW%	89.80%	6.47%	0.0 %	3.73%	100.00%
	COL%	6.75%	2.52%	0.0 %	0.19%	2.83%
	MEAN	102.40	103.65	0.0	105.47	102.60
	S.D.	8.17	7.28	0.0	6.79	8.09
	MIN	69.58	90.57	0.0	90.57	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	0.0	114.29	122.50
HEMOPHILIA	N	66	45	15	256	382
	ROW%	17.28%	11.78%	3.93%	67.02%	100.00%
	COL%	1.23%	4.36%	13.64%	3.32%	2.69%
	MEAN	102.63	104.29	105.10	102.31	102.71
	S.D.	7.75	7.92	7.17	8.27	8.14
	MIN	83.27	76.88	91.48	69.58	69.58
	MAX	121.58	118.85	116.11	122.50	122.50
CARDIOPULMONARY DISEASE	N	317	29	1	51	398
	ROW%	79.65%	7.29%	0.25%	12.81%	100.00%
	COL%	5.93%	2.81%	0.91%	0.66%	2.80%
	MEAN	102.90	102.02	98.78	101.30	102.62
	S.D.	8.03	7.95	0.0	8.44	8.09
	MIN	69.58	81.44	98.78	78.71	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	98.78	120.67	122.50
ASTHMA	N	329	26	0	44	399
	ROW%	82.46%	6.52%	0.0 %	11.03%	100.00%
	COL%	6.16%	2.52%	0.0 %	0.57%	2.81%
	MEAN	102.64	104.11	0.0	102.30	102.70
	S.D.	7.73	6.46	0.0	10.15	7.97
	MIN	76.88	94.21	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	0.0	121.58	122.50
ATHEROSCLEROSIS	N	210	22	0	146	378
	ROW%	55.56%	5.82%	0.0 %	38.62%	100.00%
	COL%	3.93%	2.13%	0.0 %	1.89%	2.66%
	MEAN	103.29	103.84	0.0	101.43	102.60
	S.D.	8.23	6.78	0.0	8.11	8.16
	MIN	73.23	94.21	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	0.0	120.67	122.50

TABLE 15 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
EMPHYSEMA	N	210	30	0	147	387
	ROW%	54.26%	7.75%	0.0 %	37.98%	100.00%
	COL%	3.93%	2.91%	0.0 %	1.90%	2.72%
	MEAN	103.35	104.74	0.0	101.61	102.79
	S.D.	7.70	8.15	0.0	8.52	8.12
	MIN	73.23	81.44	0.0	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	0.0	120.67	122.50
CYSTIC FIBROSIS	N	18	10	1	352	381
	ROW%	4.72%	2.62%	0.26%	92.39%	100.00%
	COL%	0.34%	0.97%	0.91%	4.56%	2.68%
	MEAN	101.46	105.71	100.60	102.71	102.73
	S.D.	8.24	5.64	0.0	8.21	8.16
	MIN	82.35	94.21	100.60	69.58	69.58
	MAX	115.20	115.20	100.60	122.50	122.50
ALLERGIC REACTION	N	272	20	5	93	390
	ROW%	69.74%	5.13%	1.28%	23.85%	100.00%
	COL%	5.09%	1.94%	4.55%	1.20%	2.74%
	MEAN	102.23	104.61	100.97	103.85	102.72
	S.D.	8.08	7.15	7.17	8.17	8.09
	MIN	73.23	90.57	91.48	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	118.85	109.72	122.50	122.50
AUTISM	N	24	13	1	340	378
	ROW%	6.35%	3.44%	0.26%	89.95%	100.00%
	COL%	0.45%	1.26%	0.91%	4.40%	2.66%
	MEAN	104.93	103.34	89.65	102.63	102.77
	S.D.	7.56	6.91	0.0	8.18	8.14
	MIN	92.39	87.83	89.65	69.58	69.58
	MAX	117.93	113.37	89.65	122.50	122.50
HYPERACTIVITY	N	218	26	4	137	385
	ROW%	56.62%	6.75%	1.04%	35.58%	100.00%
	COL%	4.08%	2.52%	3.64%	1.77%	2.71%
	MEAN	102.34	105.06	99.46	102.63	102.60
	S.D.	7.81	7.04	12.56	8.69	8.18
	MIN	79.62	93.30	78.71	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	112.46	121.58	122.50

TABLE 15 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
OTHER BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	N	168	20	7	175	370
	ROW%	45.41%	5.41%	1.89%	47.30%	100.00%
	COL%	3.14%	1.94%	6.36%	2.27%	2.60%
	MEAN	103.57	103.25	103.60	101.75	102.69
	S.D.	8.31	7.90	8.20	7.93	8.15
	MIN	78.71	76.88	89.65	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	115.20	114.29	118.85	122.50
LEUKEMIA	N	60	34	3	288	385
	ROW%	15.58%	8.83%	0.78%	74.81%	100.00%
	COL%	1.12%	3.30%	2.73%	3.73%	2.71%
	MEAN	102.68	104.36	103.95	102.51	102.71
	S.D.	8.41	7.13	4.96	8.14	8.09
	MIN	81.44	87.83	96.95	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	107.90	122.50	122.50
OTHER BLOOD DYSCRASIAS	N	75	38	4	252	369
	ROW%	20.33%	10.30%	1.08%	68.29%	100.00%
	COL%	1.40%	3.69%	3.64%	3.26%	2.60%
	MEAN	104.02	103.53	101.06	102.27	102.74
	S.D.	7.34	9.10	7.81	8.14	8.12
	MIN	78.71	76.88	91.48	69.58	69.58
	MAX	117.02	122.50	112.46	122.50	122.50
BRAIN TUMORS	N	54	22	2	301	379
	ROW%	14.25%	5.80%	0.53%	79.42%	100.00%
	COL%	1.01%	2.13%	1.82%	3.90%	2.67%
	MEAN	103.05	105.74	116.57	102.44	102.79
	S.D.	8.08	9.52	4.11	7.86	8.08
	MIN	83.27	81.44	112.46	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	122.50	120.67	118.85	122.50
SARCOMAS	N	34	22	1	320	377
	ROW%	9.02%	5.84%	0.27%	84.88%	100.00%
	COL%	0.64%	2.13%	0.91%	4.14%	2.65%
	MEAN	102.02	103.88	105.16	102.80	102.80
	S.D.	9.07	6.10	0.0	8.07	8.06
	MIN	81.44	94.21	105.16	69.58	69.58
	MAX	122.50	117.02	105.16	122.50	122.50

TABLE 15 (continued)

```
                     MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
                 1976 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
              PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

                                             PATIENT MANAGEMENT
                                 | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO    ||         ||
      HANDICAP                   | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT ||  TOTAL  ||
||                               |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| SQUAMOUS CELL               N|     78 |     46 |      3 |     261 ||     388 ||
|| CARCINOMA                ROW%|  20.10%|  11.86%|   0.77%|   67.27%||  100.00%||
||                          COL%|   1.46%|   4.46%|   2.73%|    3.38%||    2.73%||
||                          MEAN| 103.22 | 105.54 | 100.90 |  102.22 ||  102.80 ||
||                          S.D.|   8.32 |   7.27 |   6.76 |    7.95 ||    8.01 ||
||                           MIN|  81.44 |  90.57 |  91.48 |   69.58 ||   69.58 ||
||                           MAX| 122.50 | 122.50 | 106.99 |  122.50 ||  122.50 ||
||                               |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| OTHER NEOPLASM              N|    120 |     35 |      7 |     214 ||     376 ||
||                          ROW%|  31.91%|   9.31%|   1.86%|   56.91%||  100.00%||
||                          COL%|   2.25%|   3.39%|   6.36%|    2.77%||    2.65%||
||                          MEAN| 104.32 | 105.40 | 102.03 |  101.37 ||  102.70 ||
||                          S.D.|   7.43 |   6.05 |   6.11 |    8.51 ||    8.09 ||
||                           MIN|  78.71 |  94.21 |  92.39 |   69.58 ||   69.58 ||
||                           MAX| 122.50 | 118.85 | 108.81 |  122.50 ||  122.50 ||
||                               |        |        |        |         ||         ||
============================================================================




                    CHI-SQUARE=      4578.7812
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

162

TABLE 16

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MENTAL RETARD-ATION	N	232	46	8	83	369
	ROW%	62.87%	12.47%	2.17%	22.49%	100.00%
	COL%	4.55%	4.32%	6.72%	1.20%	2.80%
	MEAN	103.49	104.16	103.73	103.83	103.66
	S.D.	7.60	5.22	6.34	6.50	7.08
	MIN	80.00	89.26	96.21	86.95	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	113.18	117.04	119.35
CEREBRAL PALSY	N	114	40	4	203	361
	ROW%	31.58%	11.08%	1.11%	56.23%	100.00%
	COL%	2.23%	3.76%	3.36%	2.94%	2.73%
	MEAN	102.89	103.30	106.43	104.08	103.65
	S.D.	7.60	5.77	3.20	7.01	7.08
	MIN	80.00	90.80	102.38	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	110.87	119.35	119.35
BLINDNESS	N	131	41	1	190	363
	ROW%	36.09%	11.29%	0.28%	52.34%	100.00%
	COL%	2.57%	3.85%	0.84%	2.75%	2.75%
	MEAN	103.18	104.83	107.78	103.39	103.49
	S.D.	7.93	5.03	0.0	7.05	7.20
	MIN	80.00	95.43	107.78	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	107.78	119.35	119.35
DEAFNESS	N	195	34	1	131	361
	ROW%	54.02%	9.42%	0.28%	36.29%	100.00%
	COL%	3.82%	3.19%	0.84%	1.90%	2.73%
	MEAN	103.30	104.13	100.84	103.96	103.61
	S.D.	7.87	5.03	0.0	6.45	7.15
	MIN	80.00	95.43	100.84	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	100.84	119.35	119.35
EPILEPSY	N	277	36	0	61	374
	ROW%	74.06%	9.63%	0.0 %	16.31%	100.00%
	COL%	5.43%	3.38%	0.0 %	0.88%	2.83%
	MEAN	103.45	104.63	0.0	103.88	103.63
	S.D.	7.59	4.41	0.0	6.46	7.17
	MIN	80.00	96.21	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	113.18	0.0	117.04	119.35

TABLE 16 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

HANDICAP		PATIENT MANAGEMENT TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
STROKE	N	185	35	1	144	365
	ROW%	50.68%	9.59%	0.27%	39.45%	100.00%
	COL%	3.62%	3.29%	0.84%	2.08%	2.77%
	MEAN	102.95	104.54	103.92	104.23	103.61
	S.D.	7.88	5.24	0.0	6.44	7.14
	MIN	80.00	90.80	103.92	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	116.27	103.92	117.04	119.35
PARKINSONISM	N	112	34	1	211	358
	ROW%	31.28%	9.50%	0.28%	58.94%	100.00%
	COL%	2.19%	3.19%	0.84%	3.05%	2.71%
	MEAN	104.02	104.17	102.38	103.45	103.70
	S.D.	7.65	5.86	0.0	7.05	7.14
	MIN	80.00	90.03	102.38	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	116.27	102.38	119.35	119.35
ARTHRITIS	N	304	19	0	48	371
	ROW%	81.94%	5.12%	0.0 %	12.94%	100.00%
	COL%	5.96%	1.78%	0.0 %	0.69%	2.81%
	MEAN	103.18	105.63	0.0	105.63	103.62
	S.D.	7.35	4.27	0.0	5.80	7.10
	MIN	80.00	96.21	0.0	96.21	80.00
	MAX	119.35	113.18	0.0	119.35	119.35
POLIOMYELITIS	N	49	10	1	286	346
	ROW%	14.16%	2.89%	0.29%	82.66%	100.00%
	COL%	0.96%	0.94%	0.84%	4.14%	2.62%
	MEAN	103.53	105.70	88.49	103.67	103.66
	S.D.	8.84	7.04	0.0	6.78	7.16
	MIN	80.00	95.43	88.49	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	88.49	119.35	119.35
SPINAL CORD INJURIES	N	81	37	2	235	355
	ROW%	22.82%	10.42%	0.56%	66.20%	100.00%
	COL%	1.59%	3.47%	1.68%	3.40%	2.69%
	MEAN	103.13	105.88	95.43	103.52	103.64
	S.D.	7.98	5.23	6.94	7.03	7.17
	MIN	80.00	97.75	88.49	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	102.38	119.35	119.35

TABLE 16(continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS	N	94	29	0	234	357
	ROW%	26.33%	8.12%	0.0 %	65.55%	100.00%
	COL%	1.84%	2.72%	0.0 %	3.39%	2.70%
	MEAN	104.15	104.99	0.0	103.24	103.62
	S.D.	7.37	5.26	0.0	7.23	7.15
	MIN	80.00	96.21	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	115.50	0.0	119.35	119.35
MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY	N	42	26	0	281	349
	ROW%	12.03%	7.45%	0.0 %	80.52%	100.00%
	COL%	0.82%	2.44%	0.0 %	4.07%	2.64%
	MEAN	102.56	104.13	0.0	103.68	103.58
	S.D.	9.11	5.18	0.0	6.90	7.11
	MIN	80.00	90.80	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	113.18	0.0	119.35	119.35
FACIAL TRAUMA FROM ACCIDENTS	N	218	47	4	97	366
	ROW%	59.56%	12.84%	1.09%	26.50%	100.00%
	COL%	4.27%	4.41%	3.36%	1.40%	2.77%
	MEAN	103.21	104.12	104.50	104.16	103.59
	S.D.	7.70	5.30	10.99	6.16	7.11
	MIN	80.00	90.80	86.95	87.72	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	117.04	117.04	119.35
MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED	N	98	47	4	212	361
	ROW%	27.15%	13.02%	1.11%	58.73%	100.00%
	COL%	1.92%	4.41%	3.36%	3.07%	2.73%
	MEAN	102.13	104.69	108.55	103.72	103.47
	S.D.	7.25	5.91	6.29	7.21	7.13
	MIN	80.77	90.80	97.75	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	113.18	119.35	119.35
THE HOME-BOUND PATIENT	N	56	18	3	266	343
	ROW%	16.33%	5.25%	0.87%	77.55%	100.00%
	COL%	1.10%	1.69%	2.52%	3.85%	2.60%
	MEAN	104.02	103.36	103.41	103.45	103.54
	S.D.	6.46	5.58	4.56	7.41	7.16
	MIN	86.95	90.80	96.98	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	111.64	107.01	119.35	119.35

TABLE 16(continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
THE NURSING-HOME PATIENT	N	113	47	6	189	355
	ROW%	31.83%	13.24%	1.69%	53.24%	100.00%
	COL%	2.21%	4.41%	5.04%	2.73%	2.69%
	MEAN	103.02	104.07	107.14	103.73	103.61
	S.D.	7.62	5.56	4.91	7.10	7.09
	MIN	80.00	90.80	100.84	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	113.95	119.35	119.35
CLEFT PALATE (AND CLEFT LIP)	N	119	35	8	198	360
	ROW%	33.06%	9.72%	2.22%	55.00%	100.00%
	COL%	2.33%	3.29%	6.72%	2.86%	2.73%
	MEAN	103.22	105.11	97.65	103.62	103.50
	S.D.	7.12	5.28	11.45	7.06	7.13
	MIN	80.00	96.21	80.00	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	110.87	119.35	119.35
OTHER CRANIOFACIAL ANOMALIES	N	53	26	3	267	349
	ROW%	15.19%	7.45%	0.86%	76.50%	100.00%
	COL%	1.04%	2.44%	2.52%	3.86%	2.64%
	MEAN	103.66	104.66	100.84	103.47	103.57
	S.D.	6.65	5.70	12.58	7.31	7.18
	MIN	80.00	95.43	83.86	80.00	80.00
	MAX	116.27	119.35	113.95	119.35	119.35
SPINA BIFIDA	N	17	7	0	325	349
	ROW%	4.87%	2.01%	0.0 %	93.12%	100.00%
	COL%	0.33%	0.66%	0.0 %	4.70%	2.64%
	MEAN	101.61	100.39	0.0	103.72	103.55
	S.D.	7.76	2.76	0.0	7.15	7.15
	MIN	83.86	95.43	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	114.72	103.92	0.0	119.35	119.35
THALIDOMIDE	N	10	9	0	322	341
	ROW%	2.93%	2.64%	0.0 %	94.43%	100.00%
	COL%	0.20%	0.85%	0.0 %	4.66%	2.58%
	MEAN	104.15	106.07	0.0	103.55	103.63
	S.D.	4.28	6.04	0.0	7.26	7.17
	MIN	96.98	97.75	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	110.09	119.35	0.0	119.35	119.35

TABLE 16 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
DIABETES	N	337	21	1	18	377
	ROW%	89.39%	5.57%	0.27%	4.77%	100.00%
	COL%	6.60%	1.97%	0.84%	0.26%	2.86%
	MEAN	103.49	105.47	97.75	105.04	103.66
	S.D.	7.32	5.60	0.0	4.56	7.14
	MIN	80.00	96.21	97.75	98.52	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	97.75	114.72	119.35
HEMOPHILIA	N	62	41	10	234	347
	ROW%	17.87%	11.82%	2.88%	67.44%	100.00%
	COL%	1.21%	3.85%	8.40%	3.39%	2.63%
	MEAN	102.99	104.15	99.83	103.84	103.61
	S.D.	6.74	5.94	9.16	7.25	7.12
	MIN	86.95	90.80	80.77	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	114.72	119.35	119.35
CARDIOPULMONARY DISEASE	N	307	25	3	36	371
	ROW%	82.75%	6.74%	0.81%	9.70%	100.00%
	COL%	6.01%	2.35%	2.52%	0.52%	2.81%
	MEAN	103.71	104.54	100.84	103.51	103.72
	S.D.	7.23	5.12	2.89	7.36	7.10
	MIN	80.00	90.80	97.75	87.72	80.00
	MAX	119.35	113.18	104.69	117.04	119.35
ASTHMA	N	321	21	1	30	373
	ROW%	86.06%	5.63%	0.27%	8.04%	100.00%
	COL%	6.29%	1.97%	0.84%	0.43%	2.83%
	MEAN	103.39	104.25	100.84	106.26	103.66
	S.D.	7.28	5.05	0.0	6.02	7.11
	MIN	80.00	96.21	100.84	88.49	80.00
	MAX	119.35	113.18	100.84	117.04	119.35
ATHEROSCLEROSIS	N	251	19	0	91	361
	ROW%	69.53%	5.26%	0.0 %	25.21%	100.00%
	COL%	4.92%	1.78%	0.0 %	1.32%	2.73%
	MEAN	103.93	106.24	0.0	102.59	103.71
	S.D.	7.11	4.59	0.0	7.38	7.12
	MIN	80.00	99.29	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	115.50	0.0	117.04	119.35

TABLE 16 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

HANDICAP		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
EMPHYSEMA	N	212	29	4	121	366
	ROW%	57.92%	7.92%	1.09%	33.06%	100.00%
	COL%	4.15%	2.72%	3.36%	1.75%	2.77%
	MEAN	102.80	105.47	101.41	104.66	103.61
	S.D.	7.56	5.43	2.46	6.56	7.13
	MIN	80.00	96.21	97.75	86.95	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	104.69	119.35	119.35
CYSTIC FIBROSIS	N	28	10	1	309	348
	ROW%	8.05%	2.87%	0.29%	88.79%	100.00%
	COL%	0.55%	0.94%	0.84%	4.47%	2.64%
	MEAN	102.54	103.77	100.84	103.73	103.63
	S.D.	7.55	4.24	0.0	7.18	7.14
	MIN	80.00	97.75	100.84	80.00	80.00
	MAX	116.27	110.87	100.84	119.35	119.35
ALLERGIC REACTION	N	260	21	3	83	367
	ROW%	70.84%	5.72%	0.82%	22.62%	100.00%
	COL%	5.09%	1.97%	2.52%	1.20%	2.78%
	MEAN	103.71	106.02	91.06	103.52	103.70
	S.D.	6.97	6.18	4.77	7.46	7.14
	MIN	80.00	96.21	86.95	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	97.75	118.58	119.35
AUTISM	N	20	16	1	308	345
	ROW%	5.80%	4.64%	0.29%	89.28%	100.00%
	COL%	0.39%	1.50%	0.84%	4.46%	2.61%
	MEAN	102.15	103.05	103.15	103.74	103.62
	S.D.	5.93	3.59	0.0	7.35	7.14
	MIN	90.03	96.21	103.15	80.00	80.00
	MAX	110.09	110.09	103.15	119.35	119.35
HYPERACTIVITY	N	167	23	9	155	354
	ROW%	47.18%	6.50%	2.54%	43.79%	100.00%
	COL%	3.27%	2.16%	7.56%	2.24%	2.68%
	MEAN	103.13	101.10	101.26	104.68	103.63
	S.D.	7.70	5.52	7.09	6.50	7.13
	MIN	80.00	89.26	88.49	87.72	80.00
	MAX	119.35	111.64	113.18	119.35	119.35

TABLE 16 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF
1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF
PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
OTHER BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	N	195	26	9	118	348
	ROW%	56.03%	7.47%	2.59%	33.91%	100.00%
	COL%	3.82%	2.44%	7.56%	1.71%	2.64%
	MEAN	103.67	104.87	106.07	103.75	103.85
	S.D.	7.03	6.00	5.89	7.23	7.02
	MIN	80.00	92.35	96.98	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	113.95	119.35	119.35
LEUKEMIA	N	60	36	0	254	350
	ROW%	17.14%	10.29%	0.0 %	72.57%	100.00%
	COL%	1.18%	3.38%	0.0 %	3.67%	2.65%
	MEAN	104.62	106.58	0.0	103.01	103.65
	S.D.	6.16	5.18	0.0	7.55	7.21
	MIN	86.95	97.75	0.0	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	119.35	0.0	119.35	119.35
OTHER BLOOD DYSCRASIAS	N	95	36	3	215	349
	ROW%	27.22%	10.32%	0.86%	61.60%	100.00%
	COL%	1.86%	3.38%	2.52%	3.11%	2.64%
	MEAN	102.98	105.34	103.66	103.76	103.71
	S.D.	7.19	5.88	3.23	7.23	7.09
	MIN	80.77	90.80	99.29	80.00	80.00
	MAX	119.35	119.35	107.01	119.35	119.35
BRAIN TUMORS	N	51	22	2	273	348
	ROW%	14.66%	6.32%	0.57%	78.45%	100.00%
	COL%	1.00%	2.07%	1.68%	3.95%	2.64%
	MEAN	104.66	106.41	104.31	103.22	103.64
	S.D.	6.64	6.20	7.33	7.25	7.16
	MIN	86.95	96.21	96.98	80.00	80.00
	MAX	114.72	119.35	111.64	119.35	119.35
SARCOMAS	N	39	18	5	280	342
	ROW%	11.40%	5.26%	1.46%	81.87%	100.00%
	COL%	0.76%	1.69%	4.20%	4.05%	2.59%
	MEAN	102.26	105.94	96.98	103.80	103.64
	S.D.	7.17	4.68	11.09	7.12	7.17
	MIN	86.95	97.75	80.77	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	116.27	111.64	119.35	119.35

TABLE 16 (continued)

MEAN KNOWLEDGE TEST SCORES OF 1978 GRADUATES BY REPORTED TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

		PATIENT MANAGEMENT				
HANDICAP		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	TOTAL
SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA	N	68	42	9	234	353
	ROW%	19.26%	11.90%	2.55%	66.29%	100.00%
	COL%	1.33%	3.94%	7.56%	3.39%	2.67%
	MEAN	103.31	105.70	97.92	103.62	103.66
	S.D.	5.96	6.85	9.36	7.26	7.14
	MIN	86.95	90.03	80.77	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	119.35	107.78	119.35	119.35
OTHER NEOPLASM	N	131	36	11	170	348
	ROW%	37.64%	10.34%	3.16%	48.85%	100.00%
	COL%	2.57%	3.38%	9.24%	2.46%	2.64%
	MEAN	103.48	105.32	97.47	103.75	103.61
	S.D.	7.45	5.55	7.85	7.16	7.25
	MIN	83.86	96.21	80.77	80.00	80.00
	MAX	117.04	119.35	107.01	119.35	119.35

CHI-SQUARE= 4283.4180

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

Table 15 shows comparable data for the 1976 graduates. Again the mean test score for those who responded to the follow-up survey, 102.7, was somewhat higher than 100.9, the overall 1976 mean score.

For 26 handicapping conditions, those who reported "hospital treatment" had higher mean test scores than any other treatment group. For 21 conditions, those reporting "office treatment" had higher mean scores than did those reporting "no contact."

Table 16 shows similar data for the 1978 graduates. Again for 27 out of the 37 conditions, those reporting "hospital treatment" had higher mean scores than any other category. For only 10 of the conditions did those reporting "office treatment" have higher mean scores than those reporting "no contact."

Referrals show a mixed picture across the three surveys. The 1974 and 1978 graduates who made referrals tended to have lower mean scores, but the 1976 graduates had higher scores, on the whole.

On the whole, there is little evidence that measured knowledge relates to treatment decisions.

Relationship Between Clinical Experience as Students and Practice Experience after Graduation

Tables 17-1 through 17-37 compares, for the 1976 graduates, student experience in treating each of the handicapping conditions with practice experience after graduation. These tables provide evidence that "hands on" experience as students is important in determining later practice. Those who as students had treated two or more patients with a particular condition were more likely than those with lesser experience to accept such patients for office treatment. For 20 of the 37 conditions, "office treatment" had a larger entry than any other patient disposition. Of those who had treated one such patient, the same statement could be made for 17 out of the 37 conditions.

TABLE 17

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

MENTAL RETARDATION

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	71	12	6	26	7	122
	ROW%	58.20%	9.84%	4.92%	21.31%	5.74%	100.00%
	COL%	18.98%	20.00%	54.55%	21.31%	25.93%	20.54%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	24	10	0	8	0	42
	ROW%	57.14%	23.81%	0.0 %	19.05%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	6.42%	16.67%	0.0 %	6.56%	0.0 %	7.07%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	68	9	0	24	2	103
	ROW%	66.02%	8.74%	0.0 %	23.30%	1.94%	100.00%
	COL%	18.18%	15.00%	0.0 %	19.67%	7.41%	17.34%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	44	6	1	8	4	63
	ROW%	69.84%	9.52%	1.59%	12.70%	6.35%	100.00%
	COL%	11.76%	10.00%	9.09%	6.56%	14.81%	10.61%
NO RESPONSE	N	167	23	4	56	14	264
	ROW%	63.26%	8.71%	1.52%	21.21%	5.30%	100.00%
	COL%	44.65%	38.33%	36.36%	45.90%	51.85%	44.44%
TOTAL	N	374	60	11	122	27	594
	ROW%	62.96%	10.10%	1.85%	20.54%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 25.9154

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

172

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

CEREBRAL PALSY

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	52	20	3	105	15	195
	ROW%	26.67%	10.26%	1.54%	53.85%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	32.70%	35.71%	30.00%	32.41%	33.33%	32.83%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	10	8	0	17	6	41
	ROW%	24.39%	19.51%	0.0 %	41.46%	14.63%	100.00%
	COL%	6.29%	14.29%	0.0 %	5.25%	13.33%	6.90%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	32	8	1	46	2	89
	ROW%	35.96%	8.99%	1.12%	51.69%	2.25%	100.00%
	COL%	20.13%	14.29%	10.00%	14.20%	4.44%	14.98%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	5	3	0	10	2	20
	ROW%	25.00%	15.00%	0.0 %	50.00%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.14%	5.36%	0.0 %	3.09%	4.44%	3.37%
NO RESPONSE	N	60	17	6	146	20	249
	ROW%	24.10%	6.83%	2.41%	58.63%	8.03%	100.00%
	COL%	37.74%	30.36%	60.00%	45.06%	44.44%	41.92%
TOTAL	N	159	56	10	324	45	594
	ROW%	26.77%	9.43%	1.68%	54.55%	7.58%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.1409

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

BLINDNESS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	71	11	0	120	12	214
	ROW%	33.18%	5.14%	0.0 %	56.07%	5.61%	100.00%
	COL%	36.41%	30.56%	0.0 %	36.70%	33.33%	36.03%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	5	4	0	10	1	20
	ROW%	25.00%	20.00%	0.0 %	50.00%	5.00%	100.00%
	COL%	2.56%	11.11%	0.0 %	3.06%	2.78%	3.37%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	13	8	0	16	2	39
	ROW%	33.33%	20.51%	0.0 %	41.03%	5.13%	100.00%
	COL%	6.67%	22.22%	0.0 %	4.89%	5.56%	6.57%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	5	0	0	4	1	10
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	40.00%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	2.56%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.22%	2.78%	1.68%
NO RESPONSE	N	101	13	0	177	20	311
	ROW%	32.48%	4.18%	0.0 %	56.91%	6.43%	100.00%
	COL%	51.79%	36.11%	0.0 %	54.13%	55.56%	52.36%
TOTAL	N	195	36	0	327	36	594
	ROW%	32.33%	6.06%	0.0 %	55.05%	6.06%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 26.4932

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

DEAFNESS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	86	14	0	87	12	199
	ROW%	43.22%	7.04%	0.0 %	43.72%	6.03%	100.00%
	COL%	32.33%	41.18%	0.0 %	33.59%	35.29%	33.50%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	8	2	1	5	2	18
	ROW%	44.44%	11.11%	5.56%	27.78%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	3.01%	5.88%	100.00%	1.93%	5.88%	3.03%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	31	4	0	19	4	58
	ROW%	53.45%	6.90%	0.0 %	32.76%	6.90%	100.00%
	COL%	11.65%	11.76%	0.0 %	7.34%	11.76%	9.76%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	5	0	0	3	0	8
	ROW%	62.50%	0.0 %	0.0 %	37.50%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.88%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.16%	0.0 %	1.35%
NO RESPONSE	N	136	14	0	145	16	311
	ROW%	43.73%	4.50%	0.0 %	46.62%	5.14%	100.00%
	COL%	51.13%	41.18%	0.0 %	55.98%	47.06%	52.36%
TOTAL	N	266	34	1	259	34	594
	ROW%	44.78%	5.72%	0.17%	43.60%	5.72%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 41.6819

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

EPILEPSY

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	116	11	1	17	7	152
	ROW%	76.32%	7.24%	0.66%	11.18%	4.61%	100.00%
	COL%	26.61%	29.73%	33.33%	18.68%	25.93%	25.59%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	19	3	0	5	2	29
	ROW%	65.52%	10.34%	0.0 %	17.24%	6.90%	100.00%
	COL%	4.36%	8.11%	0.0 %	5.49%	7.41%	4.88%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	77	5	1	15	8	106
	ROW%	72.64%	4.72%	0.94%	14.15%	7.55%	100.00%
	COL%	17.66%	13.51%	33.33%	16.48%	29.63%	17.85%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	24	1	0	4	1	30
	ROW%	80.00%	3.33%	0.0 %	13.33%	3.33%	100.00%
	COL%	5.50%	2.70%	0.0 %	4.40%	3.70%	5.05%
NO RESPONSE	N	200	17	1	50	9	277
	ROW%	72.20%	6.14%	0.36%	18.05%	3.25%	100.00%
	COL%	45.87%	45.95%	33.33%	54.95%	33.33%	46.63%
TOTAL	N	436	37	3	91	27	594
	ROW%	73.40%	6.23%	0.51%	15.32%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 10.2437

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

STROKE

```
                                          PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                             ________________________________________________________________
                             | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO    |   NO    ||          ||
 STUDENT EXPERIENCE          | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT |RESPONSE ||  TOTAL   ||
______________________________________________________________________________________________
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-          N |   104  |    12  |     2  |    63   |    13   ||    194   ||
|| TION OF PATIENT      ROW% | 53.61% |  6.19% |  1.03% |  32.47% |   6.70% ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% | 34.90% | 27.27% | 50.00% |  29.86% |  35.14% ||   32.66% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT        N |    18  |     3  |     0  |     9   |     1   ||     31   ||
|| OF PATIENT           ROW% | 58.06% |  9.68% |  0.0 % |  29.03% |   3.23% ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% |  6.04% |  6.82% |  0.0 % |   4.27% |   2.70% ||    5.22% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N |    28  |     6  |     0  |    12   |     5   ||     51   ||
|| ONE PATIENT          ROW% | 54.90% | 11.76% |  0.0 % |  23.53% |   9.80% ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% |  9.40% | 13.64% |  0.0 % |   5.69% |  13.51% ||    8.59% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N |     5  |     1  |     0  |     3   |     0   ||      9   ||
|| TWO OR MORE          ROW% | 55.56% | 11.11% |  0.0 % |  33.33% |   0.0 % ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% |  1.68% |  2.27% |  0.0 % |   1.42% |   0.0 % ||    1.52% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| NO RESPONSE             N |   143  |    22  |     2  |   124   |    18   ||    309   ||
||                      ROW% | 46.28% |  7.12% |  0.65% |  40.13% |   5.83% ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% | 47.99% | 50.00% | 50.00% |  58.77% |  48.65% ||   52.02% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
==============================================================================================
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
|| TOTAL                   N |   298  |    44  |     4  |   211   |    37   ||    594   ||
||                      ROW% | 50.17% |  7.41% |  0.67% |  35.52% |   6.23% ||  100.00% ||
||                      COL% |100.00% |100.00% |100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% ||  100.00% ||
||                           |        |        |        |         |         ||          ||
==============================================================================================


                    CHI-SQUARE=          12.1586
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

PARKINSONISM

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	68	16	0	114	18	216
	ROW%	31.48%	7.41%	0.0 %	52.78%	8.33%	100.00%
	COL%	40.48%	42.11%	0.0 %	33.43%	39.13%	36.36%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	7	4	0	11	3	25
	ROW%	28.00%	16.00%	0.0 %	44.00%	12.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.17%	10.53%	0.0 %	3.23%	6.52%	4.21%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	5	3	0	18	2	28
	ROW%	17.86%	10.71%	0.0 %	64.29%	7.14%	100.00%
	COL%	2.98%	7.89%	0.0 %	5.28%	4.35%	4.71%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	0	1	3
	ROW%	66.67%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	33.33%	100.00%
	COL%	1.19%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	2.17%	0.51%
NO RESPONSE	N	86	15	1	198	22	322
	ROW%	26.71%	4.66%	0.31%	61.49%	6.83%	100.00%
	COL%	51.19%	39.47%	100.00%	58.06%	47.83%	54.21%
TOTAL	N	168	38	1	341	46	594
	ROW%	28.28%	6.40%	0.17%	57.41%	7.74%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 19.0800

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

ARTHRITIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	96	5	0	16	8	125
	ROW%	76.80%	4.00%	0.0 %	12.80%	6.40%	100.00%
	COL%	20.73%	16.67%	0.0 %	20.25%	36.36%	21.04%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	12	3	0	1	2	18
	ROW%	66.67%	16.67%	0.0 %	5.56%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	2.59%	10.00%	0.0 %	1.27%	9.09%	3.03%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	86	8	0	7	1	102
	ROW%	84.31%	7.84%	0.0 %	6.86%	0.98%	100.00%
	COL%	18.57%	26.67%	0.0 %	8.86%	4.55%	17.17%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	22	1	0	1	4	28
	ROW%	78.57%	3.57%	0.0 %	3.57%	14.29%	100.00%
	COL%	4.75%	3.33%	0.0 %	1.27%	18.18%	4.71%
NO RESPONSE	N	247	13	0	54	7	321
	ROW%	76.95%	4.05%	0.0 %	16.82%	2.18%	100.00%
	COL%	53.35%	43.33%	0.0 %	68.35%	31.82%	54.04%
TOTAL	N	463	30	0	79	22	594
	ROW%	77.95%	5.05%	0.0 %	13.30%	3.70%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 34.9422

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

POLIOMYELITIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	41	7	0	142	17	207
	ROW%	19.81%	3.38%	0.0 %	68.60%	8.21%	100.00%
	COL%	46.07%	46.67%	0.0 %	32.57%	32.08%	34.85%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	2	0	7	0	9
	ROW%	0.0 %	22.22%	0.0 %	77.78%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	13.33%	0.0 %	1.61%	0.0 %	1.52%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	1	0	14	4	22
	ROW%	13.64%	4.55%	0.0 %	63.64%	18.18%	100.00%
	COL%	3.37%	6.67%	0.0 %	3.21%	7.55%	3.70%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	3	0	3
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.69%	0.0 %	0.51%
NO RESPONSE	N	45	5	1	270	32	353
	ROW%	12.75%	1.42%	0.28%	76.49%	9.07%	100.00%
	COL%	50.56%	33.33%	100.00%	61.93%	60.38%	59.43%
TOTAL	N	89	15	1	436	53	594
	ROW%	14.98%	2.53%	0.17%	73.40%	8.92%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 28.4937

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

SPINAL CORD INJURIES

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	33	17	0	126	19	195
	ROW%	16.92%	8.72%	0.0 %	64.62%	9.74%	100.00%
	COL%	30.84%	42.50%	0.0 %	31.82%	39.58%	32.83%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	3	0	0	9	0	12
	ROW%	25.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	75.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	2.80%	0.0 %	0.0 %	2.27%	0.0 %	2.02%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	12	2	0	18	2	34
	ROW%	35.29%	5.88%	0.0 %	52.94%	5.88%	100.00%
	COL%	11.21%	5.00%	0.0 %	4.55%	4.17%	5.72%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	1	0	3	0	5
	ROW%	20.00%	20.00%	0.0 %	60.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.93%	2.50%	0.0 %	0.76%	0.0 %	0.84%
NO RESPONSE	N	58	20	3	240	27	348
	ROW%	16.67%	5.75%	0.86%	68.97%	7.76%	100.00%
	COL%	54.21%	50.00%	100.00%	60.61%	56.25%	58.59%
TOTAL	N	107	40	3	396	48	594
	ROW%	18.01%	6.73%	0.51%	66.67%	8.08%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.1738

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTA-	N	32	12	0	147	14	205
TION OF PATIENT	ROW%	15.61%	5.85%	0.0 %	71.71%	6.83%	100.00%
	COL%	36.36%	35.29%	0.0 %	34.92%	28.00%	34.51%
HELPED TREATMENT	N	1	1	0	13	1	16
OF PATIENT	ROW%	6.25%	6.25%	0.0 %	81.25%	6.25%	100.00%
	COL%	1.14%	2.94%	0.0 %	3.09%	2.00%	2.69%
RESPONSIBLE FOR	N	7	7	0	10	6	30
ONE PATIENT	ROW%	23.33%	23.33%	0.0 %	33.33%	20.00%	100.00%
	COL%	7.95%	20.59%	0.0 %	2.38%	12.00%	5.05%
RESPONSIBLE FOR	N	1	0	0	1	1	3
TWO OR MORE	ROW%	33.33%	0.0 %	0.0 %	33.33%	33.33%	100.00%
	COL%	1.14%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.24%	2.00%	0.51%
NO RESPONSE	N	47	14	1	250	28	340
	ROW%	13.82%	4.12%	0.29%	73.53%	8.24%	100.00%
	COL%	53.41%	41.18%	100.00%	59.38%	56.00%	57.24%
TOTAL	N	88	34	1	421	50	594
	ROW%	14.81%	5.72%	0.17%	70.88%	8.42%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 36.8605

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	22	4	1	148	20	195
	ROW%	11.28%	2.05%	0.51%	75.90%	10.26%	100.00%
	COL%	31.43%	21.05%	33.33%	33.18%	35.71%	32.83%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	2	3	0	19	3	27
	ROW%	7.41%	11.11%	0.0 %	70.37%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	2.86%	15.79%	0.0 %	4.26%	5.36%	4.55%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	7	1	0	17	4	29
	ROW%	24.14%	3.45%	0.0 %	58.62%	13.79%	100.00%
	COL%	10.00%	5.26%	0.0 %	3.81%	7.14%	4.88%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	1	0	0	1	4
	ROW%	50.00%	25.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	2.86%	5.26%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.79%	0.67%
NO RESPONSE	N	37	10	2	262	28	339
	ROW%	10.91%	2.95%	0.59%	77.29%	8.26%	100.00%
	COL%	52.86%	52.63%	66.67%	58.74%	50.00%	57.07%
TOTAL	N	70	19	3	446	56	594
	ROW%	11.78%	3.20%	0.51%	75.08%	9.43%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 28.5600

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

FACIAL TRAUMA FROM ACCIDENTS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	86	17	7	27	9	146
	ROW%	58.90%	11.64%	4.79%	18.49%	6.16%	100.00%
	COL%	23.56%	27.42%	41.18%	23.28%	26.47%	24.58%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	47	7	1	8	4	67
	ROW%	70.15%	10.45%	1.49%	11.94%	5.97%	100.00%
	COL%	12.88%	11.29%	5.88%	6.90%	11.76%	11.28%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	38	4	1	7	0	50
	ROW%	76.00%	8.00%	2.00%	14.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	10.41%	6.45%	5.88%	6.03%	0.0 %	8.42%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	14	2	1	2	2	21
	ROW%	66.67%	9.52%	4.76%	9.52%	9.52%	100.00%
	COL%	3.84%	3.23%	5.88%	1.72%	5.88%	3.54%
NO RESPONSE	N	180	32	7	72	19	310
	ROW%	58.06%	10.32%	2.26%	23.23%	6.13%	100.00%
	COL%	49.32%	51.61%	41.18%	62.07%	55.88%	52.19%
TOTAL	N	365	62	17	116	34	594
	ROW%	61.45%	10.44%	2.86%	19.53%	5.72%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.6376
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	50	14	0	90	10	164
	ROW%	30.49%	8.54%	0.0 %	54.88%	6.10%	100.00%
	COL%	31.06%	29.17%	0.0 %	27.27%	18.87%	27.61%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	8	3	0	19	2	32
	ROW%	25.00%	9.38%	0.0 %	59.38%	6.25%	100.00%
	COL%	4.97%	6.25%	0.0 %	5.76%	3.77%	5.39%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	19	7	0	28	9	63
	ROW%	30.16%	11.11%	0.0 %	44.44%	14.29%	100.00%
	COL%	11.80%	14.58%	0.0 %	8.48%	16.98%	10.61%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	10	4	0	6	2	22
	ROW%	45.45%	18.18%	0.0 %	27.27%	9.09%	100.00%
	COL%	6.21%	8.33%	0.0 %	1.82%	3.77%	3.70%
NO RESPONSE	N	74	20	2	187	30	313
	ROW%	23.64%	6.39%	0.64%	59.74%	9.58%	100.00%
	COL%	45.96%	41.67%	100.00%	56.67%	56.60%	52.69%
TOTAL	N	161	48	2	330	53	594
	ROW%	27.10%	8.08%	0.34%	55.56%	8.92%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.1467

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

THE HOME-BOUND PATIENT

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	28	6	1	137	16	188
	ROW%	14.89%	3.19%	0.53%	72.87%	8.51%	100.00%
	COL%	32.56%	33.33%	100.00%	31.64%	28.57%	31.65%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	2	1	0	6	0	9
	ROW%	22.22%	11.11%	0.0 %	66.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	2.33%	5.56%	0.0 %	1.39%	0.0 %	1.52%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	1	0	0	8	4	13
	ROW%	7.69%	0.0 %	0.0 %	61.54%	30.77%	100.00%
	COL%	1.16%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.85%	7.14%	2.19%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	1	0	5	2	8
	ROW%	0.0 %	12.50%	0.0 %	62.50%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	5.56%	0.0 %	1.15%	3.57%	1.35%
NO RESPONSE	N	55	10	0	277	34	376
	ROW%	14.63%	2.66%	0.0 %	73.67%	9.04%	100.00%
	COL%	63.95%	55.56%	0.0 %	63.97%	60.71%	63.30%
TOTAL	N	86	18	1	433	56	594
	ROW%	14.48%	3.03%	0.17%	72.90%	9.43%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 18.8608

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

THE NURSING-HOME PATIENT

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	49	17	0	89	12	167
	ROW%	29.34%	10.18%	0.0 %	53.29%	7.19%	100.00%
	COL%	26.63%	28.33%	0.0 %	29.47%	29.27%	28.11%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	4	6	1	18	0	29
	ROW%	13.79%	20.69%	3.45%	62.07%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	2.17%	10.00%	14.29%	5.96%	0.0 %	4.88%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	13	3	0	9	4	29
	ROW%	44.83%	10.34%	0.0 %	31.03%	13.79%	100.00%
	COL%	7.07%	5.00%	0.0 %	2.98%	9.76%	4.88%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	5	0	8	0	16
	ROW%	18.75%	31.25%	0.0 %	50.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.63%	8.33%	0.0 %	2.65%	0.0 %	2.69%
NO RESPONSE	N	115	29	6	178	25	353
	ROW%	32.58%	8.22%	1.70%	50.42%	7.08%	100.00%
	COL%	62.50%	48.33%	85.71%	58.94%	60.98%	59.45%
TOTAL	N	184	60	7	302	41	594
	ROW%	30.98%	10.10%	1.18%	50.84%	6.90%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 30.2037

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

CLEFT PALATE (AND CLEFT LIP)

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	82	16	3	95	16	212
	ROW%	38.68%	7.55%	1.42%	44.81%	7.55%	100.00%
	COL%	35.34%	36.36%	37.50%	34.93%	42.11%	35.69%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	17	4	0	25	1	47
	ROW%	36.17%	8.51%	0.0 %	53.19%	2.13%	100.00%
	COL%	7.33%	9.09%	0.0 %	9.19%	2.63%	7.91%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	22	2	0	15	2	41
	ROW%	53.66%	4.88%	0.0 %	36.59%	4.88%	100.00%
	COL%	9.48%	4.55%	0.0 %	5.51%	5.26%	6.90%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	3	1	2	0	9
	ROW%	33.33%	33.33%	11.11%	22.22%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.29%	6.82%	12.50%	0.74%	0.0 %	1.52%
NO RESPONSE	N	108	19	4	135	19	285
	ROW%	37.89%	6.67%	1.40%	47.37%	6.67%	100.00%
	COL%	46.55%	43.18%	50.00%	49.63%	50.00%	47.98%
TOTAL	N	232	44	8	272	38	594
	ROW%	39.06%	7.41%	1.35%	45.79%	6.40%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 24.0508

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

OTHER CRANIOFACIAL ANOMALIES

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	32	16	2	130	22	202
	ROW%	15.84%	7.92%	0.99%	64.36%	10.89%	100.00%
	COL%	39.02%	48.48%	40.00%	31.25%	37.93%	34.01%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	3	4	0	10	1	18
	ROW%	16.67%	22.22%	0.0 %	55.56%	5.56%	100.00%
	COL%	3.66%	12.12%	0.0 %	2.40%	1.72%	3.03%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	4	1	0	11	3	19
	ROW%	21.05%	5.26%	0.0 %	57.89%	15.79%	100.00%
	COL%	4.88%	3.03%	0.0 %	2.64%	5.17%	3.20%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	3	1	6
	ROW%	33.33%	0.0 %	0.0 %	50.00%	16.67%	100.00%
	COL%	2.44%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.72%	1.72%	1.01%
NO RESPONSE	N	41	12	3	262	31	349
	ROW%	11.75%	3.44%	0.86%	75.07%	8.88%	100,00%
	COL%	50.00%	36.36%	60.00%	62.98%	53.45%	58.75%
TOTAL	N	82	33	5	416	58	594
	ROW%	13.80%	5.56%	0.84%	70.03%	9.76%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 24.1093

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

SPINA BIFIDA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	10	5	0	164	16	195
	ROW%	5.13%	2.56%	0.0 %	84.10%	8.21%	100.00%
	COL%	26.32%	38.46%	0.0 %	33.47%	30.19%	32.83%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	1	0	5	0	6
	ROW%	0.0 %	16.67%	0.0 %	83.33%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	7.69%	0.0 %	1.02%	0.0 %	1.01%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	5	1	0	7	3	16
	ROW%	31.25%	6.25%	0.0 %	43.75%	18.75%	100.00%
	COL%	13.16%	7.69%	0.0 %	1.43%	5.66%	2.69%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
NO RESPONSE	N	23	6	0	314	34	377
	ROW%	6.10%	1.59%	0.0 %	83.29%	9.02%	100.00%
	COL%	60.53%	46.15%	0.0 %	64.08%	64.15%	63.47%
TOTAL	N	38	13	0	490	53	594
	ROW%	6.40%	2.19%	0.0 %	82.49%	8.92%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 29.4525
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

THALIDOMIDE

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	7	3	1	171	20	202
	ROW%	3.47%	1.49%	0.50%	84.65%	9.90%	100.00%
	COL%	50.00%	60.00%	50.00%	33.14%	35.09%	34.01%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	0	0	5	0	5
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.97%	0.0 %	0.84%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	0	0	0	1	0	1
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.19%	0.0 %	0.17%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	1	0	1
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.19%	0.0 %	0.17%
NO RESPONSE	N	7	2	1	338	37	385
	ROW%	1.82%	0.52%	0.26%	87.79%	9.61%	100.00%
	COL%	50.00%	40.00%	50.00%	65.50%	64.91%	64.81%
TOTAL	N	14	5	2	516	57	594
	ROW%	2.36%	0.84%	0.34%	86.87%	9.60%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 4.4434

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

DIABETES

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	89	6	0	4	6	105
	ROW%	84.76%	5.71%	0.0 %	3.81%	5.71%	100.00%
	COL%	17.28%	18.75%	0.0 %	16.00%	28.57%	17.68%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	21	0	0	1	0	22
	ROW%	95.45%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.55%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	4.08%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.00%	0.0 %	3.70%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	114	8	0	5	4	131
	ROW%	87.02%	6.11%	0.0 %	3.82%	3.05%	100.00%
	COL%	22.14%	25.00%	0.0 %	20.00%	19.05%	22.05%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	48	4	0	0	1	53
	ROW%	90.57%	7.55%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.89%	100.00%
	COL%	9.32%	12.50%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.76%	8.92%
NO RESPONSE	N	243	14	1	15	10	283
	ROW%	85.87%	4.95%	0.35%	5.30%	3.53%	100.00%
	COL%	47.18%	43.75%	100.00%	60.00%	47.62%	47.64%
TOTAL	N	515	32	1	25	21	594
	ROW%	86.70%	5.39%	0.17%	4.21%	3.54%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 9.1541

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

HEMOPHILIA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	33	23	9	133	23	221
	ROW%	14.93%	10.41%	4.07%	60.18%	10.41%	100.00%
	COL%	35.11%	42.59%	37.50%	35.56%	47.92%	37.21%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	5	3	1	17	1	27
	ROW%	18.52%	11.11%	3.70%	62.96%	3.70%	100.00%
	COL%	5.32%	5.56%	4.17%	4.55%	2.08%	4.55%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	3	0	10	0	16
	ROW%	18.75%	18.75%	0.0 %	62.50%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.19%	5.56%	0.0 %	2.67%	0.0 %	2.69%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	1	0	2	0	3
	ROW%	0.0 %	33.33%	0.0 %	66.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	1.85%	0.0 %	0.53%	0.0 %	0.51%
NO RESPONSE	N	53	24	14	212	24	327
	ROW%	16.21%	7.34%	4.28%	64.83%	7.34%	100.00%
	COL%	56.38%	44.44%	58.33%	56.68%	50.00%	55.05%
TOTAL	N	94	54	24	374	48	594
	ROW%	15.82%	9.09%	4.04%	62.96%	8.08%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 11.2150

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

193

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

CARDIOPULMONARY DISEASE

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	75	10	1	19	4	109
	ROW%	68.81%	9.17%	0.92%	17.43%	3.67%	100.00%
	COL%	16.41%	27.03%	100.00%	26.03%	15.38%	18.35%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	25	3	0	2	2	32
	ROW%	78.13%	9.38%	0.0 %	6.25%	6.25%	100.00%
	COL%	5.47%	8.11%	0.0 %	2.74%	7.69%	5.39%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	77	5	0	8	6	96
	ROW%	80.21%	5.21%	0.0 %	8.33%	6.25%	100.00%
	COL%	16.85%	13.51%	0.0 %	10.96%	23.08%	16.16%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	47	4	0	1	1	53
	ROW%	88.68%	7.55%	0.0 %	1.89%	1.89%	100.00%
	COL%	10.28%	10.81%	0.0 %	1.37%	3.85%	8.92%
NO RESPONSE	N	233	15	0	43	13	304
	ROW%	76.64%	4.93%	0.0 %	14.14%	4.28%	100.00%
	COL%	50.98%	40.54%	0.0 %	58.90%	50.00%	51.18%
TOTAL	N	457	37	1	73	26	594
	ROW%	76.94%	6.23%	0.17%	12.29%	4.38%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.5754

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

ASTHMA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	84	6	0	10	6	106
	ROW%	79.25%	5.66%	0.0 %	9.43%	5.66%	100.00%
	COL%	17.91%	18.75%	0.0 %	14.29%	26.09%	17.85%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	19	3	0	3	2	27
	ROW%	70.37%	11.11%	0.0 %	11.11%	7.41%	100.00%
	COL%	4.05%	9.38%	0.0 %	4.29%	8.70%	4.55%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	99	6	0	7	2	114
	ROW%	86.84%	5.26%	0.0 %	6.14%	1.75%	100.00%
	COL%	21.11%	18.75%	0.0 %	10.00%	8.70%	19.19%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	30	2	0	2	1	35
	ROW%	85.71%	5.71%	0.0 %	5.71%	2.86%	100.00%
	COL%	6.40%	6.25%	0.0 %	2.86%	4.35%	5.89%
NO RESPONSE	N	237	15	0	48	12	312
	ROW%	75.96%	4.81%	0.0 %	15.38%	3.85%	100.00%
	COL%	50.53%	46.88%	0.0 %	68.57%	52.17%	52.53%
TOTAL	N	469	32	0	70	23	594
	ROW%	78.96%	5.39%	0.0 %	11.78%	3.87%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 14.8452

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

ATHEROSCLEROSIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	67	8	0	53	17	145
	ROW%	46.21%	5.52%	0.0 %	36.55%	11.72%	100.00%
	COL%	21.54%	26.67%	0.0 %	26.37%	32.69%	24.41%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	11	0	0	8	1	20
	ROW%	55.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	40.00%	5.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.54%	0.0 %	0.0 %	3.98%	1.92%	3.37%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	38	6	0	15	6	65
	ROW%	58.46%	9.23%	0.0 %	23.08%	9.23%	100.00%
	COL%	12.22%	20.00%	0.0 %	7.46%	11.54%	10.94%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	15	2	0	2	1	20
	ROW%	75.00%	10.00%	0.0 %	10.00%	5.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.82%	6.67%	0.0 %	1.00%	1.92%	3.37%
NO RESPONSE	N	180	14	0	123	27	344
	ROW%	52.33%	4.07%	0.0 %	35.76%	7.85%	100.00%
	COL%	57.88%	46.67%	0.0 %	61.19%	51.92%	57.91%
TOTAL	N	311	30	0	201	52	594
	ROW%	52.36%	5.05%	0.0 %	33.84%	8.75%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 17.3831

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

EMPHYSEMA

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	87	14	0	62	14	177
	ROW%	49.15%	7.91%	0.0 %	35.03%	7.91%	100.00%
	COL%	27.80%	35.90%	0.0 %	30.54%	35.90%	29.80%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	10	3	0	5	2	20
	ROW%	50.00%	15.00%	0.0 %	25.00%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.19%	7.69%	0.0 %	2.46%	5.13%	3.37%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	30	2	0	8	2	42
	ROW%	71.43%	4.76%	0.0 %	19.05%	4.76%	100.00%
	COL%	9.58%	5.13%	0.0 %	3.94%	5.13%	7.07%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	5	1	0	2	1	9
	ROW%	55.56%	11.11%	0.0 %	22.22%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	1.60%	2.56%	0.0 %	0.99%	2.56%	1.52%
NO RESPONSE	N	181	19	0	126	20	346
	ROW%	52.31%	5.49%	0.0 %	36.42%	5.78%	100.00%
	COL%	57.83%	48.72%	0.0 %	62.07%	51.28%	58.25%
TOTAL	N	313	39	0	203	39	594
	ROW%	52.69%	6.57%	0.0 %	34.18%	6.57%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 12.9134

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

CYSTIC FIBROSIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	8	6	1	172	16	203
	ROW%	3.94%	2.96%	0.49%	84.73%	7.88%	100.00%
	COL%	33.33%	42.86%	100.00%	34.26%	30.19%	34.18%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	0	0	6	0	6
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.20%	0.0 %	1.01%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	1	0	0	2	1	4
	ROW%	25.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	50.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.17%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.40%	1.89%	0.67%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	1	0	1
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.20%	0.0 %	0.17%
NO RESPONSE	N	15	8	0	321	36	380
	ROW%	3.95%	2.11%	0.0 %	84.47%	9.47%	100.00%
	COL%	62.50%	57.14%	0.0 %	63.94%	67.92%	63.97%
TOTAL	N	24	14	1	502	53	594
	ROW%	4.04%	2.36%	0.17%	84.51%	8.92%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 10.1641

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

ALLERGIC REACTION

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	62	5	1	31	12	111
	ROW%	55.86%	4.50%	0.90%	27.93%	10.81%	100.00%
	COL%	16.40%	19.23%	9.09%	21.68%	33.33%	18.69%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	17	3	0	4	0	24
	ROW%	70.83%	12.50%	0.0 %	16.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	4.50%	11.54%	0.0 %	2.80%	0.0 %	4.04%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	62	3	2	14	3	84
	ROW%	73.81%	3.57%	2.38%	16.67%	3.57%	100.00%
	COL%	16.40%	11.54%	18.18%	9.79%	8.33%	14.14%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	38	3	2	9	2	54
	ROW%	70.37%	5.56%	3.70%	16.67%	3.70%	100.00%
	COL%	10.05%	11.54%	18.18%	6.29%	5.56%	9.09%
NO RESPONSE	N	199	12	6	85	19	321
	ROW%	61.99%	3.74%	1.87%	26.48%	5.92%	100.00%
	COL%	52.65%	46.15%	54.55%	59.44%	52.78%	54.04%
TOTAL	N	378	26	11	143	36	594
	ROW%	63.64%	4.38%	1.85%	24.07%	6.06%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.5696

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

AUTISM

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	12	5	0	158	19	194
	ROW%	6.19%	2.58%	0.0 %	81.44%	9.79%	100.00%
	COL%	40.00%	33.33%	0.0 %	31.98%	35.19%	32.66%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	1	2	0	9	0	12
	ROW%	8.33%	16.67%	0.0 %	75.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.33%	13.33%	0.0 %	1.82%	0.0 %	2.02%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	0	0	0	6	2	8
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.21%	3.70%	1.35%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	3	0	3
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.61%	0.0 %	0.51%
NO RESPONSE	N	17	8	1	318	33	377
	ROW%	4.51%	2.12%	0.27%	84.35%	8.75%	100.00%
	COL%	56.67%	53.33%	100.00%	64.37%	61.11%	63.47%
TOTAL	N	30	15	1	494	54	594
	ROW%	5.05%	2.53%	0.17%	83.16%	9.09%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.2653

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

HYPERACTIVITY

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	63	5	3	47	11	129
	ROW%	48.84%	3.88%	2.33%	36.43%	8.53%	100.00%
	COL%	20.93%	15.15%	42.86%	22.49%	25.00%	21.72%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	15	2	0	6	3	26
	ROW%	57.69%	7.69%	0.0 %	23.08%	11.54%	100.00%
	COL%	4.98%	6.06%	0.0 %	2.87%	6.82%	4.38%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	44	6	0	17	4	71
	ROW%	61.97%	8.45%	0.0 %	23.94%	5.63%	100.00%
	COL%	14.62%	18.18%	0.0 %	8.13%	9.09%	11.95%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	18	0	0	4	1	23
	ROW%	78.26%	0.0 %	0.0 %	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
	COL%	5.98%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.91%	2.27%	3.87%
NO RESPONSE	N	161	20	4	135	25	345
	ROW%	46.67%	5.80%	1.16%	39.13%	7.25%	100.00%
	COL%	53.49%	60.61%	57.14%	64.59%	56.82%	58.08%
TOTAL	N	301	33	7	209	44	594
	ROW%	50.67%	5.56%	1.18%	35.19%	7.41%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.4922

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

OTHER BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	32	2	2	57	14	107
	ROW%	29.91%	1.87%	1.87%	53.27%	13.08%	100.00%
	COL%	13.79%	6.90%	25.00%	22.53%	19.44%	18.01%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	9	1	0	7	0	17
	ROW%	52.94%	5.88%	0.0 %	41.18%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.88%	3.45%	0.0 %	2.77%	0.0 %	2.86%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	27	5	1	25	3	61
	ROW%	44.26%	8.20%	1.64%	40.98%	4.92%	100.00%
	COL%	11.64%	17.24%	12.50%	9.88%	4.17%	10.27%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	20	3	1	9	6	39
	ROW%	51.28%	7.69%	2.56%	23.08%	15.38%	100.00%
	COL%	8.62%	10.34%	12.50%	3.56%	8.33%	6.57%
NO RESPONSE	N	144	18	4	155	49	370
	ROW%	38.92%	4.86%	1.08%	41.89%	13.24%	100.00%
	COL%	62.07%	62.07%	50.00%	61.26%	68.06%	62.29%
TOTAL	N	232	29	8	253	72	594
	ROW%	39.06%	4.88%	1.35%	42.59%	12.12%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 22.1062

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

LEUKEMIA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	31	15	2	140	18	206
	ROW%	15.05%	7.28%	0.97%	67.96%	8.74%	100.00%
	COL%	37.35%	33.33%	66.67%	33.25%	42.86%	34.68%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	4	2	1	9	1	17
	ROW%	23.53%	11.76%	5.88%	52.94%	5.88%	100.00%
	COL%	4.82%	4.44%	33.33%	2.14%	2.38%	2.86%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	2	1	0	6	0	9
	ROW%	22.22%	11.11%	0.0 %	66.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	2.41%	2.22%	0.0 %	1.43%	0.0 %	1.52%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.48%	0.0 %	0.34%
NO RESPONSE	N	46	27	0	264	23	360
	ROW%	12.78%	7.50%	0.0 %	73.33%	6.39%	100.00%
	COL%	55.42%	60.00%	0.0 %	62.71%	54.76%	60.61%
TOTAL	N	83	45	3	421	42	594
	ROW%	13.97%	7.58%	0.51%	70.88%	7.07%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 19.0243

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

OTHER BLOOD DYSCRASIAS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	38	13	3	106	20	180
	ROW%	21.11%	7.22%	1.67%	58.89%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	34.86%	28.26%	42.86%	28.80%	31.25%	30.30%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	6	3	0	5	2	16
	ROW%	37.50%	18.75%	0.0 %	31.25%	12.50%	100.00%
	COL%	5.50%	6.52%	0.0 %	1.36%	3.13%	2.69%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	7	3	1	14	2	27
	ROW%	25.93%	11.11%	3.70%	51.85%	7.41%	100.00%
	COL%	6.42%	6.52%	14.29%	3.80%	3.13%	4.55%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	1	1	4
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	1.83%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.27%	1.56%	0.67%
NO RESPONSE	N	56	27	3	242	39	367
	ROW%	15.26%	7.36%	0.82%	65.94%	10.63%	100.00%
	COL%	51.38%	58.70%	42.86%	65.76%	60.94%	61.78%
TOTAL	N	109	46	7	368	64	594
	ROW%	18.35%	7.74%	1.18%	61.95%	10.77%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 20.7744
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

BRAIN TUMORS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	25	8	0	142	15	190
	ROW%	13.16%	4.21%	0.0 %	74.74%	7.89%	100.00%
	COL%	33.78%	27.59%	0.0 %	32.42%	29.41%	31.99%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	1	0	4	0	5
	ROW%	0.0 %	20.00%	0.0 %	80.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	3.45%	0.0 %	0.91%	0.0 %	0.84%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	1	0	0	6	1	8
	ROW%	12.50%	0.0 %	0.0 %	75.00%	12.50%	100.00%
	COL%	1.35%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.37%	1.96%	1.35%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.46%	0.0 %	0.34%
NO RESPONSE	N	48	20	2	284	35	389
	ROW%	12.34%	5.14%	0.51%	73.01%	9.00%	100.00%
	COL%	64.86%	68.97%	100.00%	64.84%	68.63%	65.49%
TOTAL	N	74	29	2	438	51	594
	ROW%	12.46%	4.88%	0.34%	73.74%	8.59%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 6.2586

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

SARCOMAS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	20	11	1	157	19	208
	ROW%	9.62%	5.29%	0.48%	75.48%	9.13%	100.00%
	COL%	43.48%	42.31%	100.00%	33.69%	34.55%	35.02%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	3	1	0	7	0	11
	ROW%	27.27%	9.09%	0.0 %	63.64%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	6.52%	3.85%	0.0 %	1.50%	0.0 %	1.85%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	2	0	0	7	0	9
	ROW%	22.22%	0.0 %	0.0 %	77.78%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	4.35%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.50%	0.0 %	1.52%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.43%	0.0 %	0.34%
NO RESPONSE	N	21	14	0	293	36	364
	ROW%	5.77%	3.85%	0.0 %	80.49%	9.89%	100.00%
	COL%	45.65%	53.85%	0.0 %	62.88%	65.45%	61.28%
TOTAL	N	46	26	1	466	55	594
	ROW%	7.74%	4.38%	0.17%	78.45%	9.26%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 17.3578

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17(continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	31	22	2	137	16	208
	ROW%	14.90%	10.58%	0.96%	65.87%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	28.18%	35.48%	40.00%	36.24%	41.03%	35.02%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	10	6	0	18	0	34
	ROW%	29.41%	17.65%	0.0 %	52.94%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	9.09%	9.68%	0.0 %	4.76%	0.0 %	5.72%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	6	4	0	9	1	20
	ROW%	30.00%	20.00%	0.0 %	45.00%	5.00%	100.00%
	COL%	5.45%	6.45%	0.0 %	2.38%	2.56%	3.37%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	0	0	2	0	5
	ROW%	60.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	40.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	2.73%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.53%	0.0 %	0.84%
NO RESPONSE	N	60	30	3	212	22	327
	ROW%	18.35%	9.17%	0.92%	64.83%	6.73%	100.00%
	COL%	54.55%	48.39%	60.00%	56.08%	56.41%	55.05%
TOTAL	N	110	62	5	378	39	594
	ROW%	18.52%	10.44%	0.84%	63.64%	6.57%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 20.1741

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 17 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1976 GRADUATES

OTHER NEOPLASM

```
                                              PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                           ______________________________________________________________________
                           | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO    | NO      ||         ||
  STUDENT EXPERIENCE       | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT |RESPONSE ||  TOTAL  ||
 __________________________________________________________________________________________
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || SEEN PRESENTA-       N |     49 |     16 |      5 |      90 |      19 ||     179 ||
 || TION OF PATIENT   ROW% | 27.37% |  8.94% |  2.79% |  50.28% |  10.61% || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% | 27.68% | 35.56% | 62.50% |  29.03% |  35.19% ||  30.13% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || HELPED TREATMENT     N |      8 |      0 |      0 |      10 |       5 ||      23 ||
 || OF PATIENT        ROW% | 34.78% |  0.0 % |  0.0 % |  43.48% |  21.74% || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% |  4.52% |  0.0 % |  0.0 % |   3.23% |   9.26% ||   3.87% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || RESPONSIBLE FOR      N |     13 |      4 |      0 |       6 |       0 ||      23 ||
 || ONE PATIENT       ROW% | 56.52% | 17.39% |  0.0 % |  26.09% |   0.0 % || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% |  7.34% |  8.89% |  0.0 % |   1.94% |   0.0 % ||   3.87% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || RESPONSIBLE FOR      N |      1 |      1 |      0 |       4 |       0 ||       6 ||
 || TWO OR MORE       ROW% | 16.67% | 16.67% |  0.0 % |  66.67% |   0.0 % || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% |  0.56% |  2.22% |  0.0 % |   1.29% |   0.0 % ||   1.01% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || NO RESPONSE          N |    106 |     24 |      3 |     200 |      30 ||     363 ||
 ||                   ROW% | 29.20% |  6.61% |  0.83% |  55.10% |   8.26% || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% | 59.89% | 53.33% | 37.50% |  64.52% |  55.56% ||  61.11% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 ==========================================================================================
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 || TOTAL                N |    177 |     45 |      8 |     310 |      54 ||     594 ||
 ||                   ROW% | 29.80% |  7.58% |  1.35% |  52.19% |   9.09% || 100.00% ||
 ||                   COL% |100.00% |100.00% |100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% || 100.00% ||
 ||                        |        |        |        |         |         ||         ||
 ==========================================================================================
```

CHI-SQUARE= 28.5694

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

208

TABLE 18

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

MENTAL RETARDATION

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	57	16	0	24	6	103
	ROW%	55.34%	15.53%	0.0 %	23.30%	5.83%	100.00%
	COL%	15.20%	23.88%	0.0 %	18.90%	25.00%	16.97%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	35	3	0	6	3	47
	ROW%	74.47%	6.38%	0.0 %	12.77%	6.38%	100.00%
	COL%	9.33%	4.48%	0.0 %	4.72%	12.50%	7.74%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	66	11	3	20	5	105
	ROW%	62.86%	10.48%	2.86%	19.05%	4.76%	100.00%
	COL%	17.60%	16.42%	21.43%	15.75%	20.83%	17.30%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	63	10	3	21	5	102
	ROW%	61.76%	9.80%	2.94%	20.59%	4.90%	100.00%
	COL%	16.80%	14.93%	21.43%	16.54%	20.83%	16.80%
NO RESPONSE	N	154	27	8	56	5	250
	ROW%	61.60%	10.80%	3.20%	22.40%	2.00%	100.00%
	COL%	41.07%	40.30%	57.14%	44.09%	20.83%	41.19%
TOTAL	N	375	67	14	127	24	607
	ROW%	61.78%	11.04%	2.31%	20.92%	3.95%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.2197

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

CEREBRAL PALSY

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	41	14	3	73	13	144
	ROW%	28.47%	9.72%	2.08%	50.69%	9.03%	100.00%
	COL%	22.04%	23.73%	60.00%	23.03%	32.50%	23.72%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	10	4	0	28	1	43
	ROW%	23.26%	9.30%	0.0 %	65.12%	2.33%	100.00%
	COL%	5.38%	6.78%	0.0 %	8.83%	2.50%	7.08%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	28	9	1	46	7	91
	ROW%	30.77%	9.89%	1.10%	50.55%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	15.05%	15.25%	20.00%	14.51%	17.50%	14.99%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	12	4	0	14	2	32
	ROW%	37.50%	12.50%	0.0 %	43.75%	6.25%	100.00%
	COL%	6.45%	6.78%	0.0 %	4.42%	5.00%	5.27%
NO RESPONSE	N	95	28	1	156	17	297
	ROW%	31.99%	9.43%	0.34%	52.53%	5.72%	100.00%
	COL%	51.08%	47.46%	20.00%	49.21%	42.50%	48.93%
TOTAL	N	186	59	5	317	40	607
	ROW%	30.64%	9.72%	0.82%	52.22%	6.59%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 11.1988

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

BLINDNESS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	64	18	1	74	15	172
	ROW%	37.21%	10.47%	0.58%	43.02%	8.72%	100.00%
	COL%	30.48%	32.73%	100.00%	24.34%	40.54%	28.34%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	12	5	0	15	2	34
	ROW%	35.29%	14.71%	0.0 %	44.12%	5.88%	100.00%
	COL%	5.71%	9.09%	0.0 %	4.93%	5.41%	5.60%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	22	5	0	21	4	52
	ROW%	42.31%	9.62%	0.0 %	40.38%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	10.48%	9.09%	0.0 %	6.91%	10.81%	8.57%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	1	0	2	0	6
	ROW%	50.00%	16.67%	0.0 %	33.33%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.43%	1.82%	0.0 %	0.66%	0.0 %	0.99%
NO RESPONSE	N	109	26	0	192	16	343
	ROW%	31.78%	7.58%	0.0 %	55.98%	4.66%	100.00%
	COL%	51.90%	47.27%	0.0 %	63.16%	43.24%	56.51%
TOTAL	N	210	55	1	304	37	607
	ROW%	34.60%	9.06%	0.16%	50.08%	6.10%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 17.0941

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

DEAFNESS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	77	14	1	52	16	160
	ROW%	48.13%	8.75%	0.63%	32.50%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	25.08%	28.57%	100.00%	24.30%	44.44%	26.36%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	17	2	0	7	2	28
	ROW%	60.71%	7.14%	0.0 %	25.00%	7.14%	100.00%
	COL%	5.54%	4.08%	0.0 %	3.27%	5.56%	4.61%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	40	9	0	21	3	73
	ROW%	54.79%	12.33%	0.0 %	28.77%	4.11%	100.00%
	COL%	13.03%	18.37%	0.0 %	9.81%	8.33%	12.03%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	4	0	0	2	0	6
	ROW%	66.67%	0.0 %	0.0 %	33.33%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.30%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.93%	0.0 %	0.99%
NO RESPONSE	N	169	24	0	132	15	340
	ROW%	49.71%	7.06%	0.0 %	38.82%	4.41%	100.00%
	COL%	55.05%	48.98%	0.0 %	61.68%	41.67%	56.01%
TOTAL	N	307	49	1	214	36	607
	ROW%	50.58%	8.07%	0.16%	35.26%	5.93%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.7530

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

EPILEPSY

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	76	10	0	21	6	113
	ROW%	67.26%	8.85%	0.0 %	18.58%	5.31%	100.00%
	COL%	17.43%	19.61%	0.0 %	21.00%	30.00%	18.62%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	30	2	0	2	1	35
	ROW%	85.71%	5.71%	0.0 %	5.71%	2.86%	100.00%
	COL%	6.88%	3.92%	0.0 %	2.00%	5.00%	5.77%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	91	10	0	21	4	126
	ROW%	72.22%	7.94%	0.0 %	16.67%	3.17%	100.00%
	COL%	20.87%	19.61%	0.0 %	21.00%	20.00%	20.76%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	30	3	0	5	3	41
	ROW%	73.17%	7.32%	0.0 %	12.20%	7.32%	100.00%
	COL%	6.88%	5.88%	0.0 %	5.00%	15.00%	6.75%
NO RESPONSE	N	209	26	0	51	6	292
	ROW%	71.58%	8.90%	0.0 %	17.47%	2.05%	100.00%
	COL%	47.94%	50.98%	0.0 %	51.00%	30.00%	48.11%
TOTAL	N	436	51	0	100	20	607
	ROW%	71.83%	8.40%	0.0 %	16.47%	3.29%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 9.9813

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

213

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

STROKE

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	77	11	1	58	8	155
	ROW%	49.68%	7.10%	0.65%	37.42%	5.16%	100.00%
	COL%	25.67%	22.45%	33.33%	26.01%	25.00%	25.54%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	11	3	0	7	4	25
	ROW%	44.00%	12.00%	0.0 %	28.00%	16.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.67%	6.12%	0.0 %	3.14%	12.50%	4.12%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	39	8	0	23	3	73
	ROW%	53.42%	10.96%	0.0 %	31.51%	4.11%	100.00%
	COL%	13.00%	16.33%	0.0 %	10.31%	9.38%	12.03%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	4	0	0	2	1	7
	ROW%	57.14%	0.0 %	0.0 %	28.57%	14.29%	100.00%
	COL%	1.33%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.90%	3.13%	1.15%
NO RESPONSE	N	169	27	2	133	16	347
	ROW%	48.70%	7.78%	0.58%	38.33%	4.61%	100.00%
	COL%	56.33%	55.10%	66.67%	59.64%	50.00%	57.17%
TOTAL	N	300	49	3	223	32	607
	ROW%	49.42%	8.07%	0.49%	36.74%	5.27%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 11.6252

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

PARKINSONISM

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	48	15	1	102	13	179
	ROW%	26.82%	8.38%	0.56%	56.98%	7.26%	100.00%
	COL%	26.23%	34.09%	100.00%	30.54%	28.89%	29.49%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	8	5	0	8	1	22
	ROW%	36.36%	22.73%	0.0 %	36.36%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	4.37%	11.36%	0.0 %	2.40%	2.22%	3.62%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	8	3	0	15	2	28
	ROW%	28.57%	10.71%	0.0 %	53.57%	7.14%	100.00%
	COL%	4.37%	6.82%	0.0 %	4.49%	4.44%	4.61%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	0	0	0	1	4
	ROW%	75.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	1.64%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	2.22%	0.66%
NO RESPONSE	N	116	21	0	209	28	374
	ROW%	31.02%	5.61%	0.0 %	55.88%	7.49%	100.00%
	COL%	63.39%	47.73%	0.0 %	62.57%	62.22%	61.61%
TOTAL	N	183	44	1	334	45	607
	ROW%	30.15%	7.25%	0.16%	55.02%	7.41%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.5389
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

ARTHRITIS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	70	4	0	12	4	90
	ROW%	77.78%	4.44%	0.0 %	13.33%	4.44%	100.00%
	COL%	14.52%	13.79%	0.0 %	16.90%	16.67%	14.83%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	20	1	0	1	1	23
	ROW%	86.96%	4.35%	0.0 %	4.35%	4.35%	100.00%
	COL%	4.15%	3.45%	0.0 %	1.41%	4.17%	3.79%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	104	11	0	8	4	127
	ROW%	81.89%	8.66%	0.0 %	6.30%	3.15%	100.00%
	COL%	21.58%	37.93%	0.0 %	11.27%	16.67%	20.92%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	45	0	0	3	3	51
	ROW%	88.24%	0.0 %	0.0 %	5.88%	5.88%	100.00%
	COL%	9.34%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.23%	12.50%	8.40%
NO RESPONSE	N	243	13	1	47	12	316
	ROW%	76.90%	4.11%	0.32%	14.87%	3.80%	100.00%
	COL%	50.41%	44.83%	100.00%	66.20%	50.00%	52.06%
TOTAL	N	482	29	1	71	24	607
	ROW%	79.41%	4.78%	0.16%	11.70%	3.95%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 18.1353

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

POLIOMYELITIS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	23	8	1	123	15	170
	ROW%	13.53%	4.71%	0.59%	72.35%	8.82%	100.00%
	COL%	26.14%	61.54%	100.00%	27.52%	25.86%	28.01%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	0	0	6	2	8
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.34%	3.45%	1.32%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	0	0	18	2	23
	ROW%	13.04%	0.0 %	0.0 %	78.26%	8.70%	100.00%
	COL%	3.41%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.03%	3.45%	3.79%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.45%	0.0 %	0.33%
NO RESPONSE	N	62	5	0	298	39	404
	ROW%	15.35%	1.24%	0.0 %	73.76%	9.65%	100.00%
	COL%	70.45%	38.46%	0.0 %	66.67%	67.24%	66.56%
TOTAL	N	88	13	1	447	58	607
	ROW%	14.50%	2.14%	0.16%	73.64%	9.56%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 14.4342

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

SPINAL CORD INJURIES

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	32	8	0	104	10	154
	ROW%	20.78%	5.19%	0.0 %	67.53%	6.49%	100.00%
	COL%	24.06%	16.67%	0.0 %	27.37%	22.73%	25.37%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	2	4	1	12	3	22
	ROW%	9.09%	18.18%	4.55%	54.55%	13.64%	100.00%
	COL%	1.50%	8.33%	50.00%	3.16%	6.82%	3.62%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	11	5	0	26	2	44
	ROW%	25.00%	11.36%	0.0 %	59.09%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	8.27%	10.42%	0.0 %	6.84%	4.55%	7.25%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	1	0	3	1	8
	ROW%	37.50%	12.50%	0.0 %	37.50%	12.50%	100.00%
	COL%	2.26%	2.08%	0.0 %	0.79%	2.27%	1.32%
NO RESPONSE	N	85	30	1	235	28	379
	ROW%	22.43%	7.92%	0.26%	62.01%	7.39%	100.00%
	COL%	63.91%	62.50%	50.00%	61.84%	63.64%	62.44%
TOTAL	N	133	48	2	380	44	607
	ROW%	21.91%	7.91%	0.33%	62.60%	7.25%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 24.5664

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	35	14	0	95	9	153
	ROW%	22.88%	9.15%	0.0 %	62.09%	5.88%	100.00%
	COL%	22.15%	35.90%	0.0 %	26.03%	20.93%	25.21%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	5	4	0	15	1	25
	ROW%	20.00%	16.00%	0.0 %	60.00%	4.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.16%	10.26%	0.0 %	4.11%	2.33%	4.12%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	13	2	0	22	2	39
	ROW%	33.33%	5.13%	0.0 %	56.41%	5.13%	100.00%
	COL%	8.23%	5.13%	0.0 %	6.03%	4.65%	6.43%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	4	0	0	4	1	9
	ROW%	44.44%	0.0 %	0.0 %	44.44%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	2.53%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.10%	2.33%	1.48%
NO RESPONSE	N	101	19	2	229	30	381
	ROW%	26.51%	4.99%	0.52%	60.10%	7.87%	100.00%
	COL%	63.92%	48.72%	100.00%	62.74%	69.77%	62.77%
TOTAL	N	158	39	2	365	43	607
	ROW%	26.03%	6.43%	0.33%	60.13%	7.08%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 13.3241

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

```
                     STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
                                    COMPARED WITH
                        PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

                                   1978 GRADUATES

                                 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

                                         PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                          ---------------------------------------------------------------
                          | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   |  NO     ||         ||
  STUDENT EXPERIENCE      | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE ||  TOTAL  ||
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-       N |     15 |     12 |      0 |    123 |      13 ||     163 ||
|| TION OF PATIENT   ROW% |  9.20% |  7.36% |  0.0 % | 75.46% |   7.98% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% | 19.48% | 33.33% |  0.0 % | 28.02% |  23.64% ||  26.85% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT     N |      6 |      3 |      0 |     10 |       2 ||      21 ||
|| OF PATIENT        ROW% | 28.57% | 14.29% |  0.0 % | 47.62% |   9.52% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% |  7.79% |  8.33% |  0.0 % |  2.28% |   3.64% ||   3.46% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N |      2 |      3 |      0 |     23 |       1 ||      29 ||
|| ONE PATIENT       ROW% |  6.90% | 10.34% |  0.0 % | 79.31% |   3.45% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% |  2.60% |  8.33% |  0.0 % |  5.24% |   1.82% ||   4.78% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N |      1 |      0 |      0 |      3 |       1 ||       5 ||
|| TWO OR MORE       ROW% | 20.00% |  0.0 % |  0.0 % | 60.00% |  20.00% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% |  1.30% |  0.0 % |  0.0 % |  0.68% |   1.82% ||   0.82% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| NO RESPONSE          N |     53 |     18 |      0 |    280 |      38 ||     389 ||
||                   ROW% | 13.62% |  4.63% |  0.0 % | 71.98% |   9.77% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% | 68.83% | 50.00% |  0.0 % | 63.78% |  69.09% ||  64.09% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
=========================================================================================
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| TOTAL                N |     77 |     36 |      0 |    439 |      55 ||     607 ||
||                   ROW% | 12.69% |  5.93% |  0.0 % | 72.32% |   9.06% || 100.00% ||
||                   COL% |100.00% |100.00% |  0.0 % |100.00% | 100.00% || 100.00% ||
||                        |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
=========================================================================================


                       CHI-SQUARE=         16.7839
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

FACIAL TRAUMA FROM ACCIDENTS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	66	20	2	36	8	132
	ROW%	50.00%	15.15%	1.52%	27.27%	6.06%	100.00%
	COL%	18.03%	32.79%	50.00%	24.32%	28.57%	21.75%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	49	5	0	13	4	71
	ROW%	69.01%	7.04%	0.0 %	18.31%	5.63%	100.00%
	COL%	13.39%	8.20%	0.0 %	8.78%	14.29%	11.70%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	26	5	1	8	3	43
	ROW%	60.47%	11.63%	2.33%	18.60%	6.98%	100.00%
	COL%	7.10%	8.20%	25.00%	5.41%	10.71%	7.08%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	16	4	1	2	2	25
	ROW%	64.00%	16.00%	4.00%	8.00%	8.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.37%	6.56%	25.00%	1.35%	7.14%	4.12%
NO RESPONSE	N	209	27	0	89	11	336
	ROW%	62.20%	8.04%	0.0 %	26.49%	3.27%	100.00%
	COL%	57.10%	44.26%	0.0 %	60.14%	39.29%	55.35%
TOTAL	N	366	61	4	148	28	607
	ROW%	60.30%	10.05%	0.66%	24.38%	4.61%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 28.7608

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

MULTIPLY-HANDICAPPED

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTA-TION OF PATIENT	N	27	10	1	72	8	118
	ROW%	22.88%	8.47%	0.85%	61.02%	6.78%	100.00%
	COL%	15.61%	15.38%	25.00%	22.22%	19.51%	19.44%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	10	6	1	16	5	38
	ROW%	26.32%	15.79%	2.63%	42.11%	13.16%	100.00%
	COL%	5.78%	9.23%	25.00%	4.94%	12.20%	6.26%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	21	11	0	40	2	74
	ROW%	28.38%	14.86%	0.0 %	54.05%	2.70%	100.00%
	COL%	12.14%	16.92%	0.0 %	12.35%	4.88%	12.19%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	11	3	0	14	1	29
	ROW%	37.93%	10.34%	0.0 %	48.28%	3.45%	100.00%
	COL%	6.36%	4.62%	0.0 %	4.32%	2.44%	4.78%
NO RESPONSE	N	104	35	2	182	25	348
	ROW%	29.89%	10.06%	0.57%	52.30%	7.18%	100.00%
	COL%	60.12%	53.85%	50.00%	56.17%	60.98%	57.33%
TOTAL	N	173	65	4	324	41	607
	ROW%	28.50%	10.71%	0.66%	53.38%	6.75%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 15.4233

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

THE HOME-BOUND PATIENT

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	23	7	1	113	14	158
	ROW%	14.56%	4.43%	0.63%	71.52%	8.86%	100.00%
	COL%	24.21%	25.93%	25.00%	27.16%	21.54%	26.03%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	1	0	8	3	12
	ROW%	0.0 %	8.33%	0.0 %	66.67%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	3.70%	0.0 %	1.92%	4.62%	1.98%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	4	0	5	0	12
	ROW%	25.00%	33.33%	0.0 %	41.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.16%	14.81%	0.0 %	1.20%	0.0 %	1.98%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	3	0	0	5	1	9
	ROW%	33.33%	0.0 %	0.0 %	55.56%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	3.16%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.20%	1.54%	1.48%
NO RESPONSE	N	66	15	3	285	47	416
	ROW%	15.87%	3.61%	0.72%	68.51%	11.30%	100.00%
	COL%	69.47%	55.56%	75.00%	68.51%	72.31%	68.53%
TOTAL	N	95	27	4	416	65	607
	ROW%	15.65%	4.45%	0.66%	68.53%	10.71%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 34.6137

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

```
                STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
                               COMPARED WITH
                   PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

                              1978 GRADUATES

                          THE NURSING-HOME PATIENT

                                           PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                             ____________________________________________________________
                             | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   |   NO    ||         ||
 STUDENT EXPERIENCE          | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE ||  TOTAL  ||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-          N|     41 |     15 |      1 |     71 |       9 ||     137 ||
|| TION OF PATIENT      ROW%| 29.93%| 10.95%|  0.73%| 51.82%|   6.57%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%| 19.25%| 21.43%| 14.29%| 25.82%|  21.43%||  22.57%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT        N|      8 |      3 |      0 |     13 |       4 ||      28 ||
|| OF PATIENT           ROW%| 28.57%| 10.71%|  0.0 %| 46.43%|  14.29%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  3.76%|  4.29%|  0.0 %|  4.73%|   9.52%||   4.61%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N|      6 |      8 |      1 |     13 |       1 ||      29 ||
|| ONE PATIENT          ROW%| 20.69%| 27.59%|  3.45%| 44.83%|   3.45%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  2.82%| 11.43%| 14.29%|  4.73%|   2.38%||   4.78%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N|     12 |      4 |      0 |     10 |       4 ||      30 ||
|| TWO OR MORE          ROW%| 40.00%| 13.33%|  0.0 %| 33.33%|  13.33%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  5.63%|  5.71%|  0.0 %|  3.64%|   9.52%||   4.94%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| NO RESPONSE             N|    146 |     40 |      5 |    168 |      24 ||     383 ||
||                      ROW%| 38.12%| 10.44%|  1.31%| 43.86%|   6.27%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%| 68.54%| 57.14%| 71.43%| 61.09%|  57.14%||  63.10%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
==========================================================================================
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| TOTAL                   N|    213 |     70 |      7 |    275 |      42 ||     607 ||
||                      ROW%| 35.09%| 11.53%|  1.15%| 45.30%|   6.92%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%| 100.00%|| 100.00%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
==========================================================================================

                    CHI-SQUARE=        20.7647
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

224

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

CLEFT PALATE (AND CLEFT LIP)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	60	19	3	93	11	186
	ROW%	32.26%	10.22%	1.61%	50.00%	5.91%	100.00%
	COL%	29.70%	39.58%	37.50%	29.81%	29.73%	30.64%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	16	7	1	20	3	47
	ROW%	34.04%	14.89%	2.13%	42.55%	6.38%	100.00%
	COL%	7.92%	14.58%	12.50%	6.41%	8.11%	7.74%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	18	2	1	18	5	44
	ROW%	40.91%	4.55%	2.27%	40.91%	11.36%	100.00%
	COL%	8.91%	4.17%	12.50%	5.77%	13.51%	7.25%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	3	2	7
	ROW%	28.57%	0.0 %	0.0 %	42.86%	28.57%	100.00%
	COL%	0.99%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.96%	5.41%	1.15%
NO RESPONSE	N	106	20	3	178	16	323
	ROW%	32.82%	6.19%	0.93%	55.11%	4.95%	100.00%
	COL%	52.48%	41.67%	37.50%	57.05%	43.24%	53.21%
TOTAL	N	202	48	8	312	37	607
	ROW%	33.28%	7.91%	1.32%	51.40%	6.10%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 19.7699

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

OTHER CRANIOFACIAL ANOMALIES

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTA- TION OF PATIENT	N	27	10	2	117	14	170
	ROW%	15.88%	5.88%	1.18%	68.82%	8.24%	100.00%
	COL%	33.33%	28.57%	28.57%	27.15%	26.42%	28.01%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	3	5	0	9	2	19
	ROW%	15.79%	26.32%	0.0 %	47.37%	10.53%	100.00%
	COL%	3.70%	14.29%	0.0 %	2.09%	3.77%	3.13%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	5	2	0	10	3	20
	ROW%	25.00%	10.00%	0.0 %	50.00%	15.00%	100.00%
	COL%	6.17%	5.71%	0.0 %	2.32%	5.66%	3.29%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	1	0	2	0	4
	ROW%	25.00%	25.00%	0.0 %	50.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.23%	2.86%	0.0 %	0.46%	0.0 %	0.66%
NO RESPONSE	N	45	17	5	293	34	394
	ROW%	11.42%	4.31%	1.27%	74.37%	8.63%	100.00%
	COL%	55.56%	48.57%	71.43%	67.98%	64.15%	64.91%
TOTAL	N	81	35	7	431	53	607
	ROW%	13.34%	5.77%	1.15%	71.00%	8.73%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 28.6288

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

SPINA BIFIDA

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	8	4	0	144	13	169
	ROW%	4.73%	2.37%	0.0 %	85.21%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	32.00%	33.33%	0.0 %	28.02%	23.64%	27.84%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	1	0	0	5	0	6
	ROW%	16.67%	0.0 %	0.0 %	83.33%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	4.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.97%	0.0 %	0.99%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.39%	0.0 %	0.33%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	0	0	1	0	2
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	50.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	4.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.19%	0.0 %	0.33%
NO RESPONSE	N	15	8	1	362	42	428
	ROW%	3.50%	1.87%	0.23%	84.58%	9.81%	100.00%
	COL%	60.00%	66.67%	100.00%	70.43%	76.36%	70.51%
TOTAL	N	25	12	1	514	55	607
	ROW%	4.12%	1.98%	0.16%	84.68%	9.06%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 15.7860
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

```
                 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
                                COMPARED WITH
                     PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

                                1978 GRADUATES

                                 THALIDOMIDE

                                         PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                             | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   |   NO   ||        ||
 STUDENT EXPERIENCE          | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE||  TOTAL ||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-          N|      6 |      5 |      0 |    137 |     13 ||    161 ||
|| TION OF PATIENT      ROW%|  3.73%|  3.11%|  0.0 %|  85.09%|  8.07%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%| 31.58%| 41.67%|  0.0 %|  26.86%| 20.00%||  26.52%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT        N|      0 |      0 |      0 |      5 |      2 ||      7 ||
|| OF PATIENT           ROW%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  71.43%| 28.57%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|   0.98%|  3.08%||   1.15%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N|      0 |      1 |      0 |      1 |      0 ||      2 ||
|| ONE PATIENT          ROW%|  0.0 %| 50.00%|  0.0 %|  50.00%|  0.0 %|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  0.0 %|  8.33%|  0.0 %|   0.20%|  0.0 %||   0.33%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR         N|      0 |      0 |      0 |      2 |      0 ||      2 ||
|| TWO OR MORE          ROW%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  0.0 %| 100.00%|  0.0 %|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|   0.39%|  0.0 %||   0.33%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| NO RESPONSE             N|     13 |      6 |      1 |    365 |     50 ||    435 ||
||                      ROW%|  2.99%|  1.38%|  0.23%|  83.91%| 11.49%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%| 68.42%| 50.00%|100.00%|  71.57%| 76.92%||  71.66%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
=====================================================================================
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
|| TOTAL                   N|     19 |     12 |      1 |    510 |     65 ||    607 ||
||                      ROW%|  3.13%|  1.98%|  0.16%|  84.02%| 10.71%|| 100.00%||
||                      COL%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%| 100.00%|100.00%|| 100.00%||
||                           |        |        |        |        |        ||        ||
=====================================================================================

                         CHI-SQUARE=        30.5821
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

DIABETES

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	 TREATM HOSPITAL	 REFERRED	 NO CONTACT	 NO RESPONSE	 TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	51	1	0	1	0	53
	ROW%	96.23%	1.89%	0.0 %	1.89%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	9.66%	2.94%	0.0 %	3.57%	0.0 %	8.73%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	24	1	0	1	2	28
	ROW%	85.71%	3.57%	0.0 %	3.57%	7.14%	100.00%
	COL%	4.55%	2.94%	0.0 %	3.57%	12.50%	4.61%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	133	11	0	8	2	154
	ROW%	86.36%	7.14%	0.0 %	5.19%	1.30%	100.00%
	COL%	25.19%	32.35%	0.0 %	28.57%	12.50%	25.37%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	75	5	1	2	5	88
	ROW%	85.23%	5.68%	1.14%	2.27%	5.68%	100.00%
	COL%	14.20%	14.71%	100.00%	7.14%	31.25%	14.50%
NO RESPONSE	N	245	16	0	16	7	284
	ROW%	86.27%	5.63%	0.0 %	5.63%	2.46%	100.00%
	COL%	46.40%	47.06%	0.0 %	57.14%	43.75%	46.79%
TOTAL	N	528	34	1	28	16	607
	ROW%	86.99%	5.60%	0.16%	4.61%	2.64%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 19.0920

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

HEMOPHILIA

```
                                       PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                          ______________________________________________________
                          | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   | NO     ||       ||
  STUDENT EXPERIENCE      | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE||  TOTAL||
 _________________________________________________________________________________
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-       N|     28 |     17 |      6 |    104 |     13 ||    168 ||
|| TION OF PATIENT   ROW%| 16.67%| 10.12%|  3.57%| 61.90%|  7.74%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%| 29.17%| 28.33%| 33.33%| 27.51%| 23.64%||  27.68%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT     N|      4 |      7 |      1 |     13 |      1 ||     26 ||
|| OF PATIENT        ROW%| 15.38%| 26.92%|  3.85%| 50.00%|  3.85%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|  4.17%| 11.67%|  5.56%|  3.44%|  1.82%||   4.28%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N|      5 |      3 |      0 |     11 |      4 ||     23 ||
|| ONE PATIENT       ROW%| 21.74%| 13.04%|  0.0 %| 47.83%| 17.39%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|  5.21%|  5.00%|  0.0 %|  2.91%|  7.27%||   3.79%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N|      1 |      0 |      0 |      1 |      1 ||      3 ||
|| TWO OR MORE       ROW%| 33.33%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %| 33.33%| 33.33%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|  1.04%|  0.0 %|  0.0 %|  0.26%|  1.82%||   0.49%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| NO RESPONSE          N|     58 |     33 |     11 |    249 |     36 ||    387 ||
||                   ROW%| 14.99%|  8.53%|  2.84%| 64.34%|  9.30%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%| 60.42%| 55.00%| 61.11%| 65.87%| 65.45%||  63.76%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
=================================================================================
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
|| TOTAL                N|     96 |     60 |     18 |    378 |     55 ||    607 ||
||                   ROW%| 15.82%|  9.88%|  2.97%| 62.27%|  9.06%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%|100.00%|| 100.00%||
||                        |        |        |        |        |        ||       ||
=================================================================================
```

CHI-SQUARE= 18.2172

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

CARDIOPULMONARY DISEASE

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	52	4	1	6	2	65
	ROW%	80.00%	6.15%	1.54%	9.23%	3.08%	100.00%
	COL%	10.81%	10.00%	14.29%	10.53%	9.09%	10.71%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	24	2	0	1	3	30
	ROW%	80.00%	6.67%	0.0 %	3.33%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.99%	5.00%	0.0 %	1.75%	13.64%	4.94%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	106	11	1	11	3	132
	ROW%	80.30%	8.33%	0.76%	8.33%	2.27%	100.00%
	COL%	22.04%	27.50%	14.29%	19.30%	13.64%	21.75%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	65	4	0	3	5	77
	ROW%	84.42%	5.19%	0.0 %	3.90%	6.49%	100.00%
	COL%	13.51%	10.00%	0.0 %	5.26%	22.73%	12.69%
NO RESPONSE	N	234	19	5	36	9	303
	ROW%	77.23%	6.27%	1.65%	11.88%	2.97%	100.00%
	COL%	48.65%	47.50%	71.43%	63.16%	40.91%	49.92%
TOTAL	N	481	40	7	57	22	607
	ROW%	79.24%	6.59%	1.15%	9.39%	3.62%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 15.4870

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

ASTHMA

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	69	4	0	7	3	83
	ROW%	83.13%	4.82%	0.0 %	8.43%	3.61%	100.00%
	COL%	13.75%	11.76%	0.0 %	14.58%	15.00%	13.67%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	25	3	0	2	3	33
	ROW%	75.76%	9.09%	0.0 %	6.06%	9.09%	100.00%
	COL%	4.98%	8.82%	0.0 %	4.17%	15.00%	5.44%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	108	6	1	10	2	127
	ROW%	85.04%	4.72%	0.79%	7.87%	1.57%	100.00%
	COL%	21.51%	17.65%	33.33%	20.83%	10.00%	20.92%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	39	2	0	0	2	43
	ROW%	90.70%	4.65%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.65%	100.00%
	COL%	7.77%	5.88%	0.0 %	0.0 %	10.00%	7.08%
NO RESPONSE	N	261	19	2	29	10	321
	ROW%	81.31%	5.92%	0.62%	9.03%	3.12%	100.00%
	COL%	51.99%	55.88%	66.67%	60.42%	50.00%	52.88%
TOTAL	N	502	34	3	48	20	607
	ROW%	82.70%	5.60%	0.49%	7.91%	3.29%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 11.7993

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

ATHEROSCLEROSIS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	66	5	0	28	5	104
	ROW%	63.46%	4.81%	0.0 %	26.92%	4.81%	100.00%
	COL%	17.51%	16.67%	0.0 %	17.83%	11.90%	17.13%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	7	2	0	5	1	15
	ROW%	46.67%	13.33%	0.0 %	33.33%	6.67%	100.00%
	COL%	1.86%	6.67%	0.0 %	3.18%	2.38%	2.47%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	50	7	0	10	4	71
	ROW%	70.42%	9.86%	0.0 %	14.08%	5.63%	100.00%
	COL%	13.26%	23.33%	0.0 %	6.37%	9.52%	11.70%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	35	3	0	2	2	42
	ROW%	83.33%	7.14%	0.0 %	4.76%	4.76%	100.00%
	COL%	9.28%	10.00%	0.0 %	1.27%	4.76%	6.92%
NO RESPONSE	N	219	13	1	112	30	375
	ROW%	58.40%	3.47%	0.27%	29.87%	8.00%	100.00%
	COL%	58.09%	43.33%	100.00%	71.34%	71.43%	61.78%
TOTAL	N	377	30	1	157	42	607
	ROW%	62.11%	4.94%	0.16%	25.86%	6.92%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 29.0574

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

EMPHYSEMA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	73	9	3	39	5	129
	ROW%	56.59%	6.98%	2.33%	30.23%	3.88%	100.00%
	COL%	21.16%	21.43%	75.00%	20.97%	16.67%	21.25%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	14	3	0	6	1	24
	ROW%	58.33%	12.50%	0.0 %	25.00%	4.17%	100.00%
	COL%	4.06%	7.14%	0.0 %	3.23%	3.33%	3.95%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	37	2	0	12	1	52
	ROW%	71.15%	3.85%	0.0 %	23.08%	1.92%	100.00%
	COL%	10.72%	4.76%	0.0 %	6.45%	3.33%	8.57%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	11	0	0	2	0	13
	ROW%	84.62%	0.0 %	0.0 %	15.38%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.19%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.08%	0.0 %	2.14%
NO RESPONSE	N	210	28	1	127	23	389
	ROW%	53.98%	7.20%	0.26%	32.65%	5.91%	100.00%
	COL%	60.87%	66.67%	25.00%	68.28%	76.67%	64.09%
TOTAL	N	345	42	4	186	30	607
	ROW%	56.84%	6.92%	0.66%	30.64%	4.94%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 19.3135

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

CYSTIC FIBROSIS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	9	6	1	129	11	156
	ROW%	5.77%	3.85%	0.64%	82.69%	7.05%	100.00%
	COL%	20.00%	35.29%	100.00%	26.43%	19.64%	25.70%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	1	0	0	8	1	10
	ROW%	10.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	80.00%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	2.22%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.64%	1.79%	1.65%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	4	0	0	12	2	18
	ROW%	22.22%	0.0 %	0.0 %	66.67%	11.11%	100.00%
	COL%	8.89%	0.0 %	0.0 %	2.46%	3.57%	2.97%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	1	1	4
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	4.44%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.20%	1.79%	0.66%
NO RESPONSE	N	29	11	0	338	41	419
	ROW%	6.92%	2.63%	0.0 %	80.67%	9.79%	100.00%
	COL%	64.44%	64.71%	0.0 %	69.26%	73.21%	69.03%
TOTAL	N	45	17	1	488	56	607
	ROW%	7.41%	2.80%	0.16%	80.40%	9.23%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 24.4997

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

ALLERGIC REACTION

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	52	3	0	17	5	77
	ROW%	67.53%	3.90%	0.0 %	22.08%	6.49%	100.00%
	COL%	12.94%	8.82%	0.0 %	12.41%	17.24%	12.69%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	23	4	0	2	0	29
	ROW%	79.31%	13.79%	0.0 %	6.90%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	5.72%	11.76%	0.0 %	1.46%	0.0 %	4.78%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	67	12	2	15	11	107
	ROW%	62.62%	11.21%	1.87%	14.02%	10.28%	100.00%
	COL%	16.67%	35.29%	40.00%	10.95%	37.93%	17.63%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	53	1	0	19	0	73
	ROW%	72.60%	1.37%	0.0 %	26.03%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	13.18%	2.94%	0.0 %	13.87%	0.0 %	12.03%
NO RESPONSE	N	207	14	3	84	13	321
	ROW%	64.49%	4.36%	0.93%	26.17%	4.05%	100.00%
	COL%	51.49%	41.18%	60.00%	61.31%	44.83%	52.88%
TOTAL	N	402	34	5	137	29	607
	ROW%	66.23%	5.60%	0.82%	22.57%	4.78%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 38.9699
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

AUTISM

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	9	4	0	135	15	163
	ROW%	5.52%	2.45%	0.0 %	82.82%	9.20%	100.00%
	COL%	28.13%	16.67%	0.0 %	27.66%	25.86%	26.85%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	1	0	10	0	11
	ROW%	0.0 %	9.09%	0.0 %	90.91%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	4.17%	0.0 %	2.05%	0.0 %	1.81%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	0	0	0	9	0	9
	ROW%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.84%	0.0 %	1.48%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	2	0	0	1	1	4
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%
	COL%	6.25%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.20%	1.72%	0.66%
NO RESPONSE	N	21	19	5	333	42	420
	ROW%	5.00%	4.52%	1.19%	79.29%	10.00%	100.00%
	COL%	65.63%	79.17%	100.00%	68.24%	72.41%	69.19%
TOTAL	N	32	24	5	488	58	607
	ROW%	5.27%	3.95%	0.82%	80.40%	9.56%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 26.3687

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

```
                 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
                                COMPARED WITH
                   PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

                               1978 GRADUATES

                                HYPERACTIVITY

                                     PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                            | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   |  NO     ||         ||
 STUDENT EXPERIENCE         | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE||  TOTAL  ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-         N |    49  |     7  |     2  |    53  |     11  ||    122  ||
|| TION OF PATIENT     ROW% | 40.16% |  5.74% |  1.64% | 43.44% |   9.02% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% | 17.25% | 21.21% | 16.67% | 22.84% |  23.91% ||  20.10% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT       N |    15  |     2  |     1  |    11  |      2  ||     31  ||
|| OF PATIENT          ROW% | 48.39% |  6.45% |  3.23% | 35.48% |   6.45% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% |  5.28% |  6.06% |  8.33% |  4.74% |   4.35% ||   5.11% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR        N |    37  |     4  |     3  |    18  |      3  ||     65  ||
|| ONE PATIENT         ROW% | 56.92% |  6.15% |  4.62% | 27.69% |   4.62% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% | 13.03% | 12.12% | 25.00% |  7.76% |   6.52% ||  10.71% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR        N |     7  |     0  |     2  |     4  |      1  ||     14  ||
|| TWO OR MORE         ROW% | 50.00% |  0.0 % | 14.29% | 28.57% |   7.14% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% |  2.46% |  0.0 % | 16.67% |  1.72% |   2.17% ||   2.31% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| NO RESPONSE            N |   176  |    20  |     4  |   146  |     29  ||    375  ||
||                     ROW% | 46.93% |  5.33% |  1.07% | 38.93% |   7.73% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% | 61.97% | 60.61% | 33.33% | 62.93% |  63.04% ||  61.78% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
====================================================================================
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
|| TOTAL                  N |   284  |    33  |    12  |   232  |     46  ||    607  ||
||                     ROW% | 46.79% |  5.44% |  1.98% | 38.22% |   7.58% || 100.00% ||
||                     COL% |100.00% |100.00% |100.00% |100.00% | 100.00% || 100.00% ||
||                          |        |        |        |        |         ||         ||
====================================================================================

                         CHI-SQUARE=        22.7947
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

OTHER BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	44	9	4	37	9	103
	ROW%	42.72%	8.74%	3.88%	35.92%	8.74%	100.00%
	COL%	14.01%	22.50%	28.57%	20.67%	15.00%	16.97%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	17	1	1	7	3	29
	ROW%	58.62%	3.45%	3.45%	24.14%	10.34%	100.00%
	COL%	5.41%	2.50%	7.14%	3.91%	5.00%	4.78%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	37	5	1	17	3	63
	ROW%	58.73%	7.94%	1.59%	26.98%	4.76%	100.00%
	COL%	11.78%	12.50%	7.14%	9.50%	5.00%	10.38%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	34	0	2	6	2	44
	ROW%	77.27%	0.0 %	4.55%	13.64%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	10.83%	0.0 %	14.29%	3.35%	3.33%	7.25%
NO RESPONSE	N	182	25	6	112	43	368
	ROW%	49.46%	6.79%	1.63%	30.43%	11.68%	100.00%
	COL%	57.96%	62.50%	42.86%	62.57%	71.67%	60.63%
TOTAL	N	314	40	14	179	60	607
	ROW%	51.73%	6.59%	2.31%	29.49%	9.88%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 25.7636

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

LEUKEMIA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTA-TION OF PATIENT	N	29	19	0	116	18	182
	ROW%	15.93%	10.44%	0.0 %	63.74%	9.89%	100.00%
	COL%	28.71%	38.00%	0.0 %	28.71%	35.29%	29.98%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	3	0	8	1	12
	ROW%	0.0 %	25.00%	0.0 %	66.67%	8.33%	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	6.00%	0.0 %	1.98%	1.96%	1.98%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	0	0	8	1	12
	ROW%	25.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	66.67%	8.33%	100.00%
	COL%	2.97%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.98%	1.96%	1.98%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	0	0	0	0	1
	ROW%	100.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.99%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.16%
NO RESPONSE	N	68	28	1	272	31	400
	ROW%	17.00%	7.00%	0.25%	68.00%	7.75%	100.00%
	COL%	67.33%	56.00%	100.00%	67.33%	60.78%	65.90%
TOTAL	N	101	50	1	404	51	607
	ROW%	16.64%	8.24%	0.16%	66.56%	8.40%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 16.0341

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

240

TABLE 18 (continued)

```
                 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
                               COMPARED WITH
                   PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

                               1978 GRADUATES

                           OTHER BLOOD DYSCRASIAS

                                         PRACTICE EXPERIENCE
                         ________________________________________________________________
                         | TREATM | TREATM |        |   NO   | NO     ||         ||
  STUDENT EXPERIENCE     | OFFICE |HOSPITAL|REFERRED| CONTACT|RESPONSE||  TOTAL  ||
______________________________________________________________________________________
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| SEEN PRESENTA-       N|     48 |     17 |      1 |     80 |     13 ||     159 ||
|| TION OF PATIENT   ROW%|  30.19%|  10.69%|   0.63%|  50.31%|   8.18%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|  34.04%|  34.00%|  16.67%|  22.60%|  23.21%||  26.19%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| HELPED TREATMENT     N|      5 |      2 |      1 |      6 |      1 ||      15 ||
|| OF PATIENT        ROW%|  33.33%|  13.33%|   6.67%|  40.00%|   6.67%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|   3.55%|   4.00%|  16.67%|   1.69%|   1.79%||   2.47%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N|      4 |      1 |      0 |      7 |      1 ||      13 ||
|| ONE PATIENT       ROW%|  30.77%|   7.69%|   0.0 %|  53.85%|   7.69%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|   2.84%|   2.00%|   0.0 %|   1.98%|   1.79%||   2.14%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| RESPONSIBLE FOR      N|      1 |      0 |      0 |      3 |      0 ||       4 ||
|| TWO OR MORE       ROW%|  25.00%|   0.0 %|   0.0 %|  75.00%|   0.0 %|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|   0.71%|   0.0 %|   0.0 %|   0.85%|   0.0 %||   0.66%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| NO RESPONSE          N|     83 |     30 |      4 |    258 |     41 ||     416 ||
||                   ROW%|  19.95%|   7.21%|   0.96%|  62.02%|   9.86%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%|  58.87%|  60.00%|  66.67%|  72.88%|  73.21%||  68.53%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
======================================================================================
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
|| TOTAL                N|    141 |     50 |      6 |    354 |     56 ||     607 ||
||                   ROW%|  23.23%|   8.24%|   0.99%|  58.32%|   9.23%|| 100.00%||
||                   COL%| 100.00%| 100.00%| 100.00%| 100.00%| 100.00%|| 100.00%||
||                       |        |        |        |        |        ||         ||
======================================================================================


                        CHI-SQUARE=        18.6943
(NOTE:  EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)
```

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

BRAIN TUMORS

STUDENT EXPERIENCE		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	21	8	2	115	13	159
	ROW%	13.21%	5.03%	1.26%	72.33%	8.18%	100.00%
	COL%	23.60%	24.24%	50.00%	27.00%	23.64%	26.19%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	0	1	0	4	0	5
	ROW%	0.0 %	20.00%	0.0 %	80.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.0 %	3.03%	0.0 %	0.94%	0.0 %	0.82%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	4	1	0	8	1	14
	ROW%	28.57%	7.14%	0.0 %	57.14%	7.14%	100.00%
	COL%	4.49%	3.03%	0.0 %	1.88%	1.82%	2.31%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	0	0	0	0	1
	ROW%	100.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.12%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.16%
NO RESPONSE	N	63	23	2	299	41	428
	ROW%	14.72%	5.37%	0.47%	69.86%	9.58%	100.00%
	COL%	70.79%	69.70%	50.00%	70.19%	74.55%	70.51%
TOTAL	N	89	33	4	426	55	607
	ROW%	14.66%	5.44%	0.66%	70.18%	9.06%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 13.2297

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

SARCOMAS

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	18	9	4	129	19	179
	ROW%	10.06%	5.03%	2.23%	72.07%	10.61%	100.00%
	COL%	28.13%	32.14%	66.67%	28.92%	30.16%	29.49%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	2	0	0	6	2	10
	ROW%	20.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	60.00%	20.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.13%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.35%	3.17%	1.65%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	2	0	0	2	1	5
	ROW%	40.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	40.00%	20.00%	100.00%
	COL%	3.13%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.45%	1.59%	0.82%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	0	0	0	0	1
	ROW%	100.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	1.56%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.16%
NO RESPONSE	N	41	19	2	309	41	412
	ROW%	9.95%	4.61%	0.49%	75.00%	9.95%	100.00%
	COL%	64.06%	67.86%	33.33%	69.28%	65.08%	67.87%
TOTAL	N	64	28	6	446	63	607
	ROW%	10.54%	4.61%	0.99%	73.48%	10.38%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 21.0067
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	27	18	4	101	18	168
	ROW%	16.07%	10.71%	2.38%	60.12%	10.71%	100.00%
	COL%	24.32%	33.33%	25.00%	27.01%	34.62%	27.68%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	8	3	2	23	3	39
	ROW%	20.51%	7.69%	5.13%	58.97%	7.69%	100.00%
	COL%	7.21%	5.56%	12.50%	6.15%	5.77%	6.43%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	3	3	0	14	1	21
	ROW%	14.29%	14.29%	0.0 %	66.67%	4.76%	100.00%
	COL%	2.70%	5.56%	0.0 %	3.74%	1.92%	3.46%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	1	0	0	1	0	2
	ROW%	50.00%	0.0 %	0.0 %	50.00%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	0.90%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.27%	0.0 %	0.33%
NO RESPONSE	N	72	30	10	235	30	377
	ROW%	19.10%	7.96%	2.65%	62.33%	7.96%	100.00%
	COL%	64.86%	55.56%	62.50%	62.83%	57.69%	62.11%
TOTAL	N	111	54	16	374	52	607
	ROW%	18.29%	8.90%	2.64%	61.61%	8.57%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 7.3642
(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

TABLE 18 (continued)

STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PATIENTS
COMPARED WITH
PRACTICE EXPERIENCE AFTER GRADUATION

1978 GRADUATES

OTHER NEOPLASM

		PRACTICE EXPERIENCE					
STUDENT EXPERIENCE		TREATM OFFICE	TREATM HOSPITAL	REFERRED	NO CONTACT	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
SEEN PRESENTATION OF PATIENT	N	49	18	7	60	22	156
	ROW%	31.41%	11.54%	4.49%	38.46%	14.10%	100.00%
	COL%	26.20%	37.50%	50.00%	20.00%	37.93%	25.70%
HELPED TREATMENT OF PATIENT	N	12	0	0	13	2	27
	ROW%	44.44%	0.0 %	0.0 %	48.15%	7.41%	100.00%
	COL%	6.42%	0.0 %	0.0 %	4.33%	3.45%	4.45%
RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE PATIENT	N	11	2	0	8	1	22
	ROW%	50.00%	9.09%	0.0 %	36.36%	4.55%	100.00%
	COL%	5.88%	4.17%	0.0 %	2.67%	1.72%	3.62%
RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO OR MORE	N	7	0	0	5	0	12
	ROW%	58.33%	0.0 %	0.0 %	41.67%	0.0 %	100.00%
	COL%	3.74%	0.0 %	0.0 %	1.67%	0.0 %	1.98%
NO RESPONSE	N	108	28	7	214	33	390
	ROW%	27.69%	7.18%	1.79%	54.87%	8.46%	100.00%
	COL%	57.75%	58.33%	50.00%	71.33%	56.90%	64.25%
TOTAL	N	187	48	14	300	58	607
	ROW%	30.81%	7.91%	2.31%	49.42%	9.56%	100.00%
	COL%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

CHI-SQUARE= 32.2779

(NOTE: EXPECTED CELL FREQUENCIES OF LESS THAN 5 HAVE BEEN USED IN THE CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION)

Of those who had assisted in treatment, "office treatment" had the largest entry for only 14 conditions, and of those who had only seen a presentation "office treatment" was the preferred disposition for only 11 conditions.

Tables 18-1 through 18-37 shows the corresponding data for the 1978 graduates, and a similar pattern emerges. Those who as students had treated two or more patients with a particular handicap were most likely to give office treatment to patients with that handicap. For 23 of the 37 conditions "office treatment" was the disposition most often reported by that category of graduate. Of those who had treated one patient, there were 16 conditions where "office treatment" was the preferred disposition. Of those who had assisted in treatment, "office treatment" was the preferred disposition for only 14 conditions, and of those who had only seen a presentation "office treatment" was the preferred disposition for only 14 conditions.

Clinical experience with handicapped patients while in dental school, it may be concluded, is highly important for improving access to dental care for the handicapped.

Table 19 examines the effect of "hands on" experience in school with selected handicapping conditions in relation to treatment of those conditions after graduation. The graduates who reported that they had only "seen a presentation" of a particular condition are compared with those who said they had treated two or more patients with that condition. For nine out of the ten conditions, a larger percentage of the 1976 graduates who had treated patients in school reported treating patients with that condition in practice than did those who had only seen a presentation. Of the 1978 graduates, this held true for eight out of the ten conditions.

Table 19

Percent of dentists who reported treating patients with selected handicapping conditions compared with in-school experience with that condition, by year of graduation

Handicap	1976				1978			
	Saw Presentation		Treated two or more		Saw Presentation		Treated two or more	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Mental retardation	68	122	79	63	71	103	72	102
Cerebral palsy	37	195	40	20	39	144	50	32
Epilepsy	84	152	80	30	76	113	80	41
Stroke (including facial paralysis)	60	194	67	9	57	155	57	7
Spinal cord injuries	26	195	40	5	26	154	50	8
Multiple sclerosis	21	205	33	3	32	153	44	9
Muscular dystrophy	13	195	75	4	17	163	20	5
Multiply-handicapped	39	164	64	22	31	118	48	29
The Nursing-home patient	40	167	50	16	41	137	53	30
Cleft palate (and cleft lip)	46	212	66	9	42	186	29	7
Average	43		59		43		50	

Over the ten conditions an average of 43 percent of those who had seen a presentation treated patients in practice, for both 1976 and 1978 graduates. An average of 59 percent of the 1976 graduates and 50 percent of the 1978 graduates who had treated two or more patients in school also treated such patients in practice.

Table 20 examines the number of different handicapping conditions treated in relation to clinical experience with handicapped patients in school. It should be noted that for the funded schools, the number of 1976 and 1978 graduates reporting no such clinical experience decreased considerably from the 1974 figures, while there was a corresponding increase in the number who reported treating two or more handicapped patients.

Of those without clinical experience in school, fewer than 27 percent of the 1974 graduates of funded schools reported that they had treated 16 or more different handicapping conditions. Almost 40 percent of the 1978 graduates said they had treated that many. In comparison, one-third of the 1978 graduates of non-funded schools had treated 16 or more conditions.

Sixteen percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools had treated five or fewer handicapping conditions, while the figures for 1978 graduates increased to 20 percent. Probably most of the 1978 graduates who did not have clinical experience in school had a definite aversion to treating handicapped patients, and carried this over into their practice. In comparison, less than 9 percent of the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools had treated five or fewer handicapping conditions.

Of those who had treated two or more handicapped patients while in school, slightly less than 30 percent of the 1974 graduates from the funded schools had treated 16 or more different conditions. For the 1978 graduates, the percentage

TABLE 20

Relationship of Reported Clinical Experience in School to Number of Different Handicapping Conditions Treated in Practice For Graduates of Funded and Non-Funded Schools, in Per Cent

Number of Handicapping Conditions Treated in Practice	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
	No Clinical Experience in School				
	N=185	N=58	N=56	N=212	N=169
21 +	9.7	8.6	10.7	8.5	11.8
16 - 20	16.8	12.1	28.6	15.1	21.3
11 - 15	36.8	44.8	23.2	36.8	36.7
6 - 10	20.5	20.7	17.9	25.5	21.3
1 - 5	11.4	5.2	14.3	9.5	4.1
0	4.9	8.6	5.4	4.7	4.7
	Treated One Handicapped Patient in School				
	N=81	N=112	N=95	N=79	N=107
21 +	4.9	9.8	17.9	16.5	14.0
16 - 20	22.2	27.7	21.1	16.5	25.2
11 - 15	28.3	25.9	34.7	26.6	32.7
6 - 10	18.5	25.0	17.9	25.3	15.9
1 - 5	11.1	8.0	4.2	5.1	7.5
0	4.9	3.6	4.2	10.1	4.7
	Treated Two or More Handicapped Patients in School				
	N=213	N=410	N=449	N=155	N=142
21 +	7.5	14.9	12.7	16.1	21.8
16 - 20	21.1	19.5	27.6	20.0	31.7
11 - 15	33.3	29.5	28.3	27.7	25.4
6 - 10	22.5	21.7	19.4	18.7	14.1
1 - 5	8.5	7.8	6.5	11.0	2.8
0	7.0	6.6	5.6	6.5	4.2

had increased to just over 40. In comparison, of the 1978 graduates at the non-funded schools, over 50 percent had treated 16 or more conditions. More than 15 percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools reported treating five or fewer different conditions. For the 1978 graduates, the comparable figure was 12 percent. However, only seven percent of the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools reported treating five or fewer conditions. It seems likely that at the non-funded schools, those students who treated two or more handicapped patients would be primarily those who were particularly interested in treating the handicapped, and that they carried this interest over into their practice. At the funded schools considerable effort was made to have as many students as possible treat several handicapped patients whether or not this was a particular interest.

Table 21 shows breadth of experience in treating selected related conditions in the office in relation to reported clinical experience in school, for graduates of funded and non-funded schools. The first section of the table covers the grouping of mental retardation and autism.

Relatively few graduates in any category reported treating both conditions, which might be expected, since autism is not encountered as frequently as mental retardation. Of those with no clinical experience in school, 58 percent of the 1974 graduates from funded schools had treated one or both conditions, and the figure increased somewhat to almost 61 percent for the 1978 graduates. The comparable figure for the 1978 graduates of non-funded schools was 58 percent.

Of those graduates who had treated two or more handicapped patients in school, 53 percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools had treated one or both conditions. Slightly more than 63 percent of the 1978 gradautes had treated one or both conditions. For the 1978 graduates of non-funded schools the figures was a little higher at more than 67 percent.

250

TABLE 21

Breadth of Experience in Treating Selected Related Conditions in the Office in Relation to Reported Clinical Experience in School in Per Cent

A. Mental Retardation and Autism

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
No Clinical Experience in School					
	N=185	N=58	N=56	N=212	N=169
Treated both conditions	2.2	1.7	3.6	5.2	2.4
Treated one condition	55.7	62.1	57.1	49.5	55.6
Treated neither condition	42.2	36.2	39.3	45.3	42.0
Treated One Handicapped Patient in School					
	N=81	N=112	N=95	N=79	N=107
Treated both conditions	3.7	1.8	6.3	1.3	5.6
Treated one condition	51.9	60.7	54.7	55.7	54.2
Treated neither condition	44.4	37.5	39.0	43.0	40.2
Treated Two or More Handicapped Patients in School					
	N=213	N=410	N=449	N=155	N=142
Treated both conditions	2.4	6.3	4.0	3.2	1.4
Treated one condition	50.7	57.3	59.5	60.0	66.2
Treated neither condition	47.0	36.3	36.5	36.8	32.4

B. Cerebral Palsy, Stroke, Parkinsonism, Spinal Cord Injuries, Multiple Sclerosis, and Muscular Dystrophy

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
No Clinical Experience in School					
	N=185	N=58	N=56	N=212	N=169
Treated 5 or 6 conditions	4.3	0	5.4	2.8	3.0
Treated 3 or 4 conditions	16.8	17.2	21.4	15.1	20.1
Treated 1 or 2 conditions	42.2	51.7	41.1	50.5	54.4
Treated no condition	36.8	31.0	32.1	31.6	22.5
Treated One Handicapped Patient in School					
	N=81	N=112	N=95	N=79	N=107
Treated 5 or 6 conditions	0	3.6	8.4	3.8	0.9
Treated 3 or 4 conditions	16.1	19.6	24.2	20.3	17.8
Treated 1 or 2 conditions	59.3	47.3	48.4	44.3	54.2
Treated no condition	24.7	29.5	19.0	31.7	27.1
Treated Two or More Handicapped Patients in School					
	N=213	N=410	N=449	N=155	N=142
Treated 5 or 6 conditions	1.9	4.1	3.8	3.9	8.9
Treated 3 or 4 conditions	12.7	17.8	22.7	19.4	24.7
Treated 1 or 2 conditions	46.5	49.0	48.1	45.8	47.9
Treated no condition	39.0	29.0	25.4	31.0	17.6

C. Nursing Home Patients

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
No Clinical Experience in School					
	N=185	N=58	N=56	N=212	N=169
Treated this condition	37.8	27.6	46.4	36.3	37.3
Did not treat this condition	62.2	72.4	53.6	63.7	62.7
Treated One Handicapped Patient in School					
	N=81	N=112	N=95	N=79	N=107
Treated this condition	35.8	36.6	34.7	34.2	36.5
Did not treat this condition	64.2	63.4	65.3	65.8	63.6
Treated Two or More Handicapped Patients in School					
	N=213	N=410	N=449	N=155	N=142
Treated this condition	28.6	30.0	34.1	36.8	43.0
Did not treat this condition	71.4	70.0	65.9	63.2	57.0

D. Cleft Palate and Other Facial Deformities

	Funded Schools			Non-Funded Schools	
	1974	1976	1978	1976	1978
No Clinical Experience in School					
	N=185	N=58	N=56	N=212	N=169
Treated both conditions	4.3	8.6	8.9	6.6	9.5
Treated one condition	26.5	32.8	26.8	26.4	25.4
Treated neither condition	69.2	58.6	64.3	67.0	65.1
Treated One Handicapped Patient in School					
	N=81	N=112	N=95	N=79	N=107
Treated both conditions	4.9	8.9	8.4	11.4	10.3
Treated one condition	32.1	35.7	30.5	19.0	29.0
Treated neither condition	63.0	55.4	61.1	69.6	60.8
Treated Two or More Handicapped Patients in School					
	N=213	N=410	N=449	N=155	N=142
Treated both conditions	8.9	8.8	8.2	14.8	13.4
Treated one condition	32.4	35.4	30.3	37.4	34.5
Treated neither condition	58.7	55.9	61.5	47.7	52.1

For the grouping of cerebral palsy, stroke, Parkinsonism, spinal cord injuries, multiple sclerosis and muscular dystrophy, of those with no clinical experience in school, 4.3 percent of the 1974 graduates of funded schools had treated 5 or 6 of these conditions. Of the 1978 graduates, 5.4 percent had treated that many conditions. Of the 1978 graduates from the non-funded schools, the comparable figure was slightly lower at 3 percent. Almost 17 percent of the graduates of the funded schools reported treating 3 or 4 of these conditions, while over 21 percent of the 1978 graduates had done so. For the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools, the figure was almost as high at 20 percent. Of those who had treated two or more handicapped patients in school, less than two percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools reported treating 5 or 6 of these conditions, comparable with almost four percent of the 1978 graduates. The figure for the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools was more than twice as high, at almost nine percent.

Almost 13 percent of the 1974 graduates of the funded schools reported treating 3 or 4 of these conditions, while nearly 23 percent of the 1978 graduates had done so. The figure for the 1978 graduates of the non-funded schools was higher once again, at 25 percent.

In the category of nursing home patients, of those with no clinical experience in school, 38 percent of the 1974 graduates of funded schools reported treating such patients, compared with over 46 percent of the 1978 graduates. Slightly more than 37 percent of the 1978 graduates of non-funded schools reported treating such patients.

Of those who reported treating two or more handicapped patients in school, almost 29 percent of the 1974 graduates of funded schools reported treating such patients, as did 34 percent of the 1978 graduates. The 1978 graduates of non-funded schools had a higher figure, 43 percent reporting treating such patients.

The fourth category of handicapping conditions is cleft palate and other facial deformities. Of those with no clinical experience in school, almost 31 percent of the 1974 graduates of funded schools reported treating one or both conditions, and this figure increased to almost 36 percent for the 1978 graduates. The figure for the 1978 graduates of non-funded schools was almost as high, at 35 percent.

Of those who reported treating two or more handicapped patients while in school, 41 percent treated one or both conditions. The 1978 graduates reported a slightly lower figure, at 38.5 percent. The figure for the graduates of non-funded schools was higher at 48 percent.

Conclusions

In summary, the data support the conclusion that the overall goal of the program, increasing the availability of dental care for the handicapped, was accomplished. Since the graduates of non-funded schools report treating as many categories of handicapped patients as did the graduates of funded schools, it appears that factors other than the instructional efforts of the funded schools were at work. It is quite likely, though, that the existence of the program itself created at least some of these factors.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaires used for follow-up survey
of 1974, 1976, and 1978 graduates

1974

QUESTIONNAIRE ON DENTAL TREATMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Some parts of this questionnaire may not apply to you (if you are a graduate student, for instance), or you may have information or experiences that are not included here. Please feel free to use the margins, the backs of pages, or extra pages to include any explanations or additional comments you'd like to make, but do complete whatever parts apply.

First some questions about you and your practice:

Please correct mailing address, if it is not correct

____

____

____

What month and year did you graduate from dental school? ____________

What school? ______________________________

How would you describe your current practice?

____ (A) Self-employed professional practice

____ (B) Professional partnership

____ (C) Employed professional practice

____ (D) Full-time residency or graduate training

____ (E) Research and/or teaching

____ (F) Military service

____ (G) Other (specify) ________________________

256

Below is a list of handicapping conditions. Please indicate by circling the appropriate letter what your experiences with each condition has been since graduation. If you have contacted more than one patient with the same condition, please indicate that, too.

A. I have treated a patient with this condition in my office.

B. I have treated a patient with this condition in a hospital.

C. I have had contact with such a patient, but referred him to another facility.

D. I have had no contact with this condition in my practice.

How Many?

A B C D 1. Mental retardation (including Down's syndrome, hydrocephaly, and brain damage)
A B C D 2. Cerebral palsy
A B C D 3. Blindness
A B C D 4. Deafness
A B C D 5. Epilepsy
A B C D 6. Stroke (including facial paralysis)
A B C D 7. Parkinsonism
A B C D 8. Arthritis
A B C D 9. Poliomyelitis
A B C D 10. Spinal cord injuries
A B C D 11. Multiple sclerosis
A B C D 12. Muscular dystrophy
A B C D 13. Facial trauma from accidents
A B C D 14. Multiply-handicapped
A B C D 15. The home-bound patient
A B C D 16. The nursing-home patient
A B C D 17. Cleft palate (and cleft lip)
A B C D 18. Other craniofacial anomalies (including microstomia and micrognathia)
A B C D 19. Spina bifida

How Many?

A B C D 20. Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations
A B C D 21. Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances
A B C D 22. Hemophilia
A B C D 23. Cardiopulmonary disease
A B C D 24. Asthma
A B C D 25. Atherosclerosis
A B C D 26. Emphysema
A B C D 27. Cystic fibrosis
A B C D 28. Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment
A B C D 29. Autism
A B C D 30. Hyperactivity
A B C D 31. Other behavior problems
A B C D 32. Leukemia
A B C D 33. Other blood dyscrasias
A B C D 34. Brain tumors
A B C D 35. Sarcomas
A B C D 36. Squamous cell carcinoma (including maxillofacial prosthetics)
A B C D 37. Other neoplasms

This is a question about your experiences while in school. Please estimate how much exposure you had to the topic of dental care for the handicapped:

Course work:

A. None at all

B. Some mention in passing

C. Perhaps one specific course

D. Several specific courses

Clinical experience;

A. None at all

B. Exposed to one or more conditions, but did not treat

C. Treated a handicapped patient

D. Treated two or more handicapped patients

Comment? ____

____

Do you feel your attitude toward treating the handicapped was changed by your school experience?

Yes ___ No ___

Comment? ____

____

Would you say you have:

A. Actively sought out opportunities to treat the handicapped?

B. Treated handicapped patients when they appeared?

C. Generally avoided treating handicapped patients?

Comment? ____

____

What steps do you feel are necessary to improve the nation's dental care of the handicapped?

____

____

____

Finally, we would be interested in any general comments you may have about your experience with handicapped patients:

____

____

____

____

____

1976

QUESTIONNAIRE ON DENTAL TREATMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Some parts of this questionnaire may not apply to you (if you are a graduate student, for instance), or you may have information or experiences that are not included here. Please feel free to use the margins, the backs of pages, or extra pages to include any explanations or additional comments you'd like to make, but do complete whatever parts apply.

Please correct mailing address above, if it is not correct.

____
____
____

First some questions about you and your practice:
How would you describe your current practice?

_____ (A) Self-employed professional practice
_____ (B) Professional partnership
_____ (C) Employed professional practice
_____ (D) Full-time residency or graduate training
_____ (E) Research and/or teaching
_____ (F) Military service
_____ (G) Other (specify)______________________________

260

Below is a list of handicapping conditions. Please indicate by circling the appropriate letter what your experiences with each condition has been since graduation. If you have been contacted by more than one patient with the same condition, and have made different dispositions, please indicate that, too. Please also indicate the total number of such patients with whom you have had contact.

A. I have treated a patient with this condition in my office.
B. I have treated a patient with this condition in a hospital.
C. I have had contact with such a patient, but referred him to another facility.
D. I have had no contact with this condition in my practice.

How Many?

A B C D 1. Mental retardation (including Down's syndrome, hydrocephaly, and brain damage)
A B C D 2. Cerebral palsy
A B C D 3. Blindness
A B C D 4. Deafness
A B C D 5. Epilepsy
A B C D 6. Stroke (including facial paralysis)
A B C D 7. Parkinsonism
A B C D 8. Arthritis
A B C D 9. Poliomyelitis
A B C D 10. Spinal cord injuries
A B C D 11. Multiple sclerosis
A B C D 12. Muscular dystrophy
A B C D 13. Facial trauma from accidents
A B C D 14. Multiply-handicapped
A B C D 15. The home-bound patient
A B C D 16. The nursing-home patient
A B C D 17. Cleft palate (and cleft lip)
A B C D 18. Other craniofacial anomalies (including microstomia and micrognathia)
A B C D 19. Spina bifida

How Many?

A B C D 20. Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations
A B C D 21. Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances
A B C D 22. Hemophilia
A B C D 23. Cardiopulmonary disease
A B C D 24. Asthma
A B C D 25. Atherosclerosis
A B C D 26. Emphysema
A B C D 27. Cystic fibrosis
A B C D 28. Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment
A B C D 29. Autism
A B C D 30. Hyperactivity
A B C D 31. Other behavior problems
A B C D 32. Leukemia
A B C D 33. Other blood dyscrasias
A B C D 34. Brain tumors
A B C D 35. Sarcomas
A B C D 36. Squamous cell carcinoma (including maxillofacial prosthetics)
A B C D 37. Other neoplasms

This is a question about your experiences while in school. Please estimate how much exposure you had to the topic of dental care for the handicapped:

Course work:	Clinical experience:
A. None at all	A. None at all
B. Some mention in passing	B. Exposed to one or more conditions, but did not treat
C. Perhaps one specific course	C. Treated a handicapped patient
D. Several specific courses	D. Treated two or more handicapped patients

Comment?____

____

Do you feel your attitude toward treating the handicapped was changed by your school experience?

A. Yes - Became more interested in treating handicapped.

B. Yes - Became less interested in treating handicapped.

C. No - Was already interested in treating handicapped.

D. No - Remained uninterested in treating the handicapped.

E. Other (Specify)________________________________

Would you say you have:

A. Actively sought out opportunities to treat the handicapped?

B. Treated handicapped patients when they appeared?

C. Generally avoided treating handicapped patients?

Comment?____

____

What steps do you feel are necessary to improve the nation's dental care of the handicapped?

____

____

____

Finally, we would be interested in any general comments you may have about your experience with handicapped patients:

____

____

____

____

____

1978

PLEASE CORRECT YOUR MAILING ADDRESS HERE, IF IT IS NOT CORRECT BELOW.

____

____

____

QUESTIONNAIRE ON DENTAL TREATMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Some parts of this questionnaire may not apply to you (if you are a graduate student for instance), or you may have information or experiences that are not included here. Please indicate the appropriate response and feel free to use the margins or extra pages to include any explanations or additional comments you'd like to make, but do complete whatever parts apply.

I. YOU AND YOUR PRACTICE:

A. How would you describe your current practice? Check as many apply.

- ☐ Self-employed professional practice
- ☐ Professional partnership
- ☐ Employed professional practice
- ☐ Full-time residency or graduate training
- ☐ Research and/or teaching
- ☐ Military service
- ☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

____

B. Would you say you have:

1. Actively sought out opportunities to treat the handicapped?
2. Treated handicapped patients when they appeared?
3. Generally avoided treating handicapped patients?

Comment? ____________________________________

C. Did you make any modifications to your office to accommodate handicapped patients?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes, check as many as apply

- ☐ Modified outside entrance
- ☐ Modified interior doors
- ☐ Modified bathroom facilities
- ☐ Provided special equipment (e.g., restraints, wheelchair lift, etc.)
- ☐ Modified operatory
- ☐ Modified X-ray facilities
- ☐ Other ____________________________________

I am not in private practice _____

673-04

264

D. Below is a list of handicapping conditions. Please indicate by circling the appropriate number what your experiences with each condition has been since graduation. If you have been contacted by more than one patient with the same condition, and have made different dispositions, please indicate that, too.

1. I have treated a patient with this condition in my office.
2. I have treated a patient with this condition in a hospital.
3. I have had contact with such a patient, but referred him/her to another facility.
4. I have had no contact with this condition in my practice.

1 2 3 4 1. Mental retardation (including Down's syndrome, hydrocephaly, and brain damage)
1 2 3 4 2. Cerebral palsy
1 2 3 4 3. Blindness
1 2 3 4 4. Deafness
1 2 3 4 5. Epilepsy
1 2 3 4 6. Stroke (including facial paralysis)
1 2 3 4 7. Parkinsonism
1 2 3 4 8. Arthritis
1 2 3 4 9. Poliomyelitis
1 2 3 4 10. Spinal cord injuries
1 2 3 4 11. Multiple sclerosis
1 2 3 4 12. Muscular dystrophy
1 2 3 4 13. Facial trauma from accidents
1 2 3 4 14. Multiply-handicapped
1 2 3 4 15. The home-bound patient
1 2 3 4 16. The nursing-home patient
1 2 3 4 17. Cleft palate (and cleft lip)
1 2 3 4 18. Other craniofacial anomalies (including microstomia and micrognathia)
1 2 3 4 19. Spina bifida
1 2 3 4 20. Thalidomide-induced deformities and similar malformations
1 2 3 4 21. Diabetes and other endocrine disturbances
1 2 3 4 22. Hemophilia
1 2 3 4 23. Cardiopulmonary disease
1 2 3 4 24. Asthma
1 2 3 4 25. Atherosclerosis
1 2 3 4 26. Emphysema
1 2 3 4 27. Cystic fibrosis
1 2 3 4 28. Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment
1 2 3 4 29. Autism
1 2 3 4 30. Hyperactivity
1 2 3 4 31. Other behavior problems
1 2 3 4 32. Leukemia
1 2 3 4 33. Other blood dyscrasias
1 2 3 4 34. Brain tumors
1 2 3 4 35. Sarcomas
1 2 3 4 36. Squamous cell carcinoma (including maxillofacial prosthetics)
1 2 3 4 37. Other neoplasms

II. YOUR EXPERIENCES WHILE IN SCHOOL

A. Please estimate how much exposure you had to the topic of dental care for the handicapped while in school.

Course Work:

1. None at all
2. Some mention in passing
3. Perhaps one specific course
4. Several specific courses

Clinical experience:

1. None at all
2. Exposed to one or more conditions, but did not treat
3. Treated a handicapped patient
4. Treated two or more handicapped patients

Comment ____

____

B. Do you feel your attitude toward treating the handicapped was changed by your school experience?

1. Yes - Became more interested in treating handicapped
2. Yes - Became less interested in treating handicapped
3. No - Was already interested in treating handicapped
4. No - Remained uninterested in treating the handicapped
5. Other (Specify) ____

III. CONTACTS WITH ORGANIZATIONS IN YOUR PRACTICE

A. What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped (e.g., Association for the Advancement of the Mentally Retarded, American Diabetic Association, Epilipsy Foundation, etc.)?

1. None
2. Incidental contacts with one or more such organizations
3. Close working relations with one organization
4. Close working relations with two or more such organizations

B. Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the Handicapped?

Yes _____

No _____

C. Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes please specify ____

____

IV. EDUCATION AND CONSULTATIONS

A. Since completing dental school, have you had additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes, did you

1. Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?
2. Have one or more short course or workshop?
3. Do informal reading and study?
4. Other ____

____

B. What consultations have you had with medical (other than dental) experts concerning handicapped patients?

1. None
2. A few consultations about selected patients
3. Frequent consultations about many patients

V. COMMENTS

A. What steps do you feel are necessary to improve the nation's dental care of the handicapped?

____

____

____

____

____

B. Finally, we would be interested in any general comments you may have about your experience with handicapped patients:

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX B

Survey results for individual funded schools

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	14	8	26
School 08				
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		43	38	31
Professional partnership		0	12	12
Employed professional practice		29	12	35
Full-time residency or graduate training		29	25	19
Research and/or teaching		21	25	12
Military service		0	0	4
Other		7	0	4
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	29	62	50
	- in hospital	36	38	46
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	29	0	12
Cerebral palsy	- in office	21	0	19
	- in hospital	36	38	50
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	43	50	38
Blindness	- in office	14	0	19
	- in hospital	21	25	31
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	64	75	38
Deafness	- in office	21	25	23
	- in hospital	21	38	31
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	57	38	38
Epilepsy	- in office	57	25	42
	- in hospital	29	38	42
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	21	25	15
Stroke	- in office	43	12	27
	- in hospital	21	25	38
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	36	62	35
Parkinsonism	- in office	21	25	8
	- in hospital	29	25	35
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	64	50	50
Arthritis	- in office	50	50	54
	- in hospital	29	38	42
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	21	12	15

School 08 continued

		N = 14 1974	N = 8 1976	N = 26 1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	7	0	15
	- in hospital	14	25	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	75	69
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	14	0	4
	- in hospital	21	25	19
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	64	75	65
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	21	0	15
	- in hospital	21	25	23
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	50	75	54
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	0	12	12
	- in hospital	21	0	23
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	88	58
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	36	25	38
	- in hospital	43	38	38
	- referred to others	0	12	4
	- no contact	29	25	19
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	14	0	12
	- in hospital	21	25	35
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	57	75	46
Home-bound patient	- in office	7	12	8
	- in hospital	14	0	15
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	64	88	69
Nursing-home patient	- in office	21	12	4
	- in hospital	21	25	31
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	57	62	58
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	29	25	27
	- in hospital	21	25	31
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	57	50	42
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	7	0	8
	- in hospital	21	38	27
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	62	54
Spina bifida	- in office	0	0	4
	- in hospital	21	0	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	100	81
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	0	0
	- in hospital	7	0	12
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	86	100	81

School 08 continued

	N =	14	8	26
		1974	1976	1978
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	71	50	69
	- in hospital	29	25	46
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	7	12	0
Hemophilia	- in office	29	12	4
	- in hospital	36	25	38
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	36	75	42
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	71	25	62
	- in hospital	43	38	35
	- referred to others	7	0	0
	- no contact	7	38	12
Asthma	- in office	86	25	69
	- in hospital	43	25	42
	- referred to others	7	0	0
	- no contact	0	50	8
Atherosclerosis	- in office	50	50	46
	- in hospital	36	25	42
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	36	25	23
Emphysema	- in office	50	25	35
	- in hospital	29	25	31
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	36	50	38
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	7	0	8
	- in hospital	21	0	19
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	57	100	65
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	43	50	46
	- in hospital	21	38	35
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	43	12	23
Autism	- in office	0	0	8
	- in hospital	29	12	15
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	88	65
Hyperactivity	- in office	36	12	35
	- in hospital	36	25	27
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	43	62	31
Other behavior problems	- in office	29	0	50
	- in hospital	21	25	35
	- referred to others	7	0	8
	- no contact	57	62	12
Leukemia	- in office	0	0	4
	- in hospital	29	38	27
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	62	62

School 08 continued		1974	1976	1978
	N =	14	8	26
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	7	12	8
	- in hospital	29	38	35
	- referred to others	0	12	0
	- no contact	64	38	54
Brain tumors	- in office	7	0	8
	- in hospital	21	12	19
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	88	65
Sarcomas	- in office	0	0	4
	- in hospital	21	25	23
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	75	62
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	7	12	8
	- in hospital	29	50	27
	- referred to others	0	12	0
	- no contact	57	50	62
Other neoplasms	- in office	29	0	19
	- in hospital	21	50	19
	- referred to others	0	12	0
	- no contact	57	38	46
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		7	0	0
Some mention in passing		50	12	12
Perhaps one specific course		36	75	58
Several specific courses		7	12	31
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		36	12	4
Exposed to one or more		14	12	4
Treated a handicapped patient		21	0	0
Treated two or more		21	75	92
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		14	0	12
Treated handicapped when they appear?		79	100	77
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		7	0	8
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		29		
Yes - became more interested			12	62
Yes - became less interested			25	4
No		64		
No - was already interested			62	23
No - remained uninterested			0	8
Other			0	4

272

School 08 continued

	1974	1976	1978
N =	14	8	26
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			8
No			62
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			4
Interior doors			4
Bathroom facilities			4
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			4
X-ray facilities			0
Other			0
Not in private practice			31
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			85
Incidental with one or more			4
Close working relations with one			12
Close working relations with two or more			0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			4
No			92
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			4
No			92
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			42
No			58
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			38
Have one or more short course or workshop?			4
Do informal reading and study?			4
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			23
A few consultations about selected patients			42
Frequent consultation about many patient			31

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

School 09		1974	1976	1978
	N =	86	113	89
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		34	25	38
Professional partnership		13	11	10
Employed professional practice		38	31	42
Full-time residency or graduate training		14	11	11
Research and/or teaching		2	4	4
Military service		7	19	6
Other		8	6	3
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	43	40	38
	- in hospital	47	32	48
	- referred to others	2	2	2
	- no contact	19	31	19
Cerebral palsy	- in office	15	22	22
	- in hospital	30	26	28
	- referred to others	2	1	1
	- no contact	49	50	51
Blindness	- in office	23	33	37
	- in hospital	22	20	29
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	48	46	34
Deafness	- in office	34	42	40
	- in hospital	27	18	29
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	35	40	33
Epilepsy	- in office	56	65	53
	- in hospital	43	26	40
	- referred to others	1	2	1
	- no contact	13	17	22
Stroke	- in office	37	40	37
	- in hospital	31	23	35
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	29	37	36
Parkinsonism	- in office	26	36	33
	- in hospital	34	20	24
	- referred to others	1	1	0
	- no contact	38	40	47
Arthritis	- in office	63	77	69
	- in hospital	34	24	34
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	9	11	13

School 09 continued

	N =	86 1974	113 1976	89 1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	14	8	6
	- in hospital	16	6	7
	- referred to others	0	1	1
	- no contact	60	79	83
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	6	4	11
	- in hospital	15	13	25
	- referred to	1	1	1
	- no contact	67	73	63
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	10	6	13
	- in hospital	22	16	19
	- referred to others	1	2	0
	- no contact	60	72	64
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	7	12	7
	- in hospital	21	10	18
	- referred to others	1	1	1
	- no contact	63	70	72
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	37	50	33
	- in hospital	44	33	44
	- referred to others	1	2	1
	- no contact	27	19	28
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	14	18	15
	- in hospital	37	21	37
	- referred to others	2	0	1
	- no contact	44	55	48
Home-bound patient	- in office	15	8	9
	- in hospital	14	7	13
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	58	76	74
Nursing-home patient	- in office	23	9	16
	- in hospital	31	25	28
	- referred to others	0	2	2
	- no contact	42	58	54
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	21	27	28
	- in hospital	23	19	27
	- referred to others	0	1	2
	- no contact	51	49	49
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	6	10	15
	- in hospital	19	15	16
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	69	66
Spina bifida	- in office	5	3	2
	- in hospital	3	4	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	86	88
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	2	6	3
	- in hospital	1	2	7
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	84	85	84

School 09 continued

	N =	86	113	89
		1974	1976	1978
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	77	81	80
	- in hospital	42	35	44
	- referred to others	0	3	0
	- no contact	1	4	2
Hemophilia	- in office	8	12	16
	- in hospital	24	19	31
	- referred to others	6	4	1
	- no contact	57	61	54
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	66	72	70
	- in hospital	47	35	43
	- referred to others	2	4	2
	- no contact	5	12	9
Asthma	- in office	70	73	76
	- in hospital	41	28	43
	- referred to others	1	1	1
	- no contact	8	15	6
Atherosclerosis	- in office	57	52	58
	- in hospital	34	24	34
	- referred to others	1	0	1
	- no contact	17	29	26
Emphysema	- in office	41	45	42
	- in hospital	31	19	31
	- referred to others	1	1	1
	- no contact	30	36	36
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	3	3	7
	- in hospital	8	5	9
	- referred to others	1	1	0
	- no contact	78	85	83
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	52	57	64
	- in hospital	34	19	28
	- referred to others	5	3	1
	- no contact	23	30	19
Autism	- in office	5	1	2
	- in hospital	7	5	9
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	73	87	82
Hyperactivity	- in office	44	37	33
	- in hospital	30	17	24
	- referred to others	2	4	6
	- no contact	28	42	45
Other behavior problems	- in office	38	38	51
	- in hospital	35	26	29
	- referred to others	2	3	3
	- no contact	22	39	28
Leukemia	- in office	9	15	12
	- in hospital	19	17	25
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	62	66	62

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	86	113	89
School 09 continued				
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	23	19	31
	- in hospital	30	19	33
	- referred to others	5	0	0
	- no contact	41	61	42
Brain tumors	- in office	3	17	8
	- in hospital	14	12	16
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	73	68	73
Sarcomas	- in office	6	5	12
	- in hospital	14	12	11
	- referred to others	1	0	2
	- no contact	66	77	72
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	10	11	17
	- in hospital	33	29	30
	- referred to others	8	2	3
	- no contact	47	58	48
Other neoplasms	- in office	22	31	31
	- in hospital	29	21	34
	- referred to others	6	2	1
	- no contact	38	48	35
Experience in school - Course work:				
	None at all	7	3	1
	Some mention in passing	50	10	3
	Perhaps one specific course	35	46	55
	Several specific courses	6	40	40
Experience in school - Clinical:				
	None at all	20	0	1
	Exposed to one or more	26	2	2
	Treated a handicapped patient	9	7	4
	Treated two or more	44	90	92
Would you say you have				
	Actively tried to treat handicapped?	14	8	10
	Treated handicapped when they appear?	80	81	85
	Generally avoided treating handicapped?	6	5	2
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
	Yes	42		
	Yes - became more interested		57	57
	Yes - became less interested		1	3
	No	53		
	No - was already interested		18	25
	No - remained uninterested		6	10
	Other		17	1

277

School 09 continued	1974	1976	1978
N =	86	113	89
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			6
No			65
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			3
Interior doors			3
Bathroom facilities			1
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			2
X-ray facilities			1
Other			0
Not in private practice			27
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			78
Incidental with one or more			17
Close working relations with one			3
Close working relations with two or more			2
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			6
No			93
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			54
No			46
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			45
Have one or more short course or workshop?			6
Do informal reading and study?			16
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			21
A few consultations about selected patients			61
Frequent consultation about many patient			18

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	26	43	29
School 01				
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		65	53	66
Professional partnership		8	5	14
Employed professional practice		12	5	7
Full-time residency or graduate training		0	7	3
Research and/or teaching		4	2	7
Military service		12	16	3
Other		0	2	7
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	65	60	59
	- in hospital	15	16	3
	- referred to others	4	5	7
	- no contact	19	23	28
Cerebral palsy	- in office	27	35	38
	- in hospital	0	16	0
	- referred to others	4	2	0
	- no contact	58	49	52
Blindness	- in office	27	33	45
	- in hospital	4	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	62	63	41
Deafness	- in office	62	49	52
	- in hospital	4	7	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	27	37	34
Epilepsy	- in office	77	84	79
	- in hospital	4	9	0
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	15	9	14
Stroke	- in office	38	51	48
	- in hospital	4	5	0
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	54	40	41
Parkinsonism	- in office	35	14	17
	- in hospital	4	5	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	58	74	62
Arthritis	- in office	73	74	79
	- in hospital	4	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	3
	- no contact	15	21	10

	N =	26	43	29
School 01 continued		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	27	35	28
	- in hospital	0	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	65	56	55
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	15	44	28
	- in hospital	12	7	0
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	73	42	59
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	15	16	10
	- in hospital	0	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	77	74	72
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	12	9	14
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	77	76
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	66	70	62
	- in hospital	23	14	3
	- referred to others	4	0	3
	- no contact	27	19	24
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	35	35	28
	- in hospital	8	12	3
	- referred to others	4	0	3
	- no contact	50	52	55
Home-bound patient	- in office	27	14	14
	- in hospital	4	7	0
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	69	77	76
Nursing-home patient	- in office	35	40	31
	- in hospital	15	12	7
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	50	47	52
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	31	33	59
	- in hospital	8	9	3
	- referred to others	8	2	7
	- no contact	50	53	24
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	15	26	28
	- in hospital	12	9	3
	- referred to others	4	0	3
	- no contact	65	58	52
Spina bifida	- in office	4	16	14
	- in hospital	0	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	88	72	76
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	2	3
	- in hospital	0	0	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	92	86	83

School 01 continued		N = 26 1974	43 1976	29 1978
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	92	86	86
	- in hospital	12	7	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	4	2	3
Hemophilia	- in office	23	16	41
	- in hospital	4	14	0
	- referred to others	15	7	10
	- no contact	50	60	38
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	85	81	66
	- in hospital	8	7	7
	- referred to others	0	5	7
	- no contact	8	9	17
Asthma	- in office	88	81	83
	- in hospital	4	7	3
	- referred to others	0	0	3
	- no contact	8	9	7
Atherosclerosis	- in office	58	47	59
	- in hospital	8	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	31	37	31
Emphysema	- in office	50	58	48
	- in hospital	8	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	3
	- no contact	38	33	38
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	0	7	10
	- in hospital	0	7	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	92	81	76
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	65	65	62
	- in hospital	12	7	0
	- referred to others	6	0	3
	- no contact	19	23	24
Autism	- in office	4	7	3
	- in hospital	0	5	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	85	84	83
Hyperactivity	- in office	50	61	55
	- in hospital	4	5	3
	- referred to others	8	0	7
	- no contact	35	28	28
Other behavior problems	- in office	42	42	59
	- in hospital	4	7	3
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	35	47	28
Leukemia	- in office	12	12	21
	- in hospital	0	9	0
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	77	74	69

		N = 26	43	29
School 01 continued		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	35	28	24
	- in hospital	0	9	0
	- referred to others	0	0	3
	- no contact	46	58	62
Brain tumors	- in office	19	9	17
	- in hospital	8	2	0
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	69	77	69
Sarcomas	- in office	12	0	7
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	88	79
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	12	14	14
	- in hospital	8	7	0
	- referred to others	8	0	10
	- no contact	77	77	66
Other neoplasms	- in office	19	26	21
	- in hospital	8	12	0
	- referred to others	15	2	14
	- no contact	62	53	45
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		8	0	0
Some mention in passing		42	9	7
Perhaps one specific course		35	47	31
Several specific courses		15	40	59
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		19	5	0
Exposed to one or more		27	7	3
Treated a handicapped patient		8	19	7
Treated two or more		46	67	86
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		15	9	17
Treated handicapped when they appear?		81	79	83
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		4	5	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		35		
Yes - became more interested			53	62
Yes - became less interested			7	0
No		65		
No - was already interested			19	31
No - remained uninterested			5	3
Other			14	0

School 01 continued		1974	1976	1978
	N =	26	43	29
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?				
Yes				48
No				41
Modifications:				
Outside entrance				41
Interior doors				38
Bathroom facilities				21
Provided special equipment				0
Operatory				17
X-ray facilities				7
Other				0
Not in private practice				7
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?				
None				66
Incidental with one or more				24
Close working relations with one				7
Close working relations with two or more				0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?				
Yes				0
No				97
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?				
Yes				14
No				83
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?				
Yes				17
No				83
If yes, did you				
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?				7
Have one or more short course or workshop?				0
Do informal reading and study?				3
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?				
None				31
A few consultations about selected patients				59
Frequent consultation about many patient				10

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		N = 38	63	50
School 02		1974	1976	1978
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		53	46	44
Professional partnership		5	6	14
Employed professional practice		32	21	20
Full-time residency or graduate training		0	8	8
Research and/or teaching		5	3	4
Military service		11	5	8
Other		5	11	10
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	53	71	66
	- in hospital	3	13	8
	- referred to others	0	3	6
	- no contact	40	11	20
Cerebral palsy	- in office	21	27	30
	- in hospital	0	13	8
	- referred to others	3	2	0
	- no contact	71	51	54
Blindness	- in office	34	30	42
	- in hospital	0	8	6
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	63	56	42
Deafness	- in office	45	41	56
	- in hospital	0	6	6
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	50	48	36
Epilepsy	- in office	68	63	80
	- in hospital	3	11	8
	- referred to others	3	0	2
	- no contact	29	21	14
Stroke	- in office	47	60	50
	- in hospital	0	10	8
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	50	22	40
Parkinsonism	- in office	42	25	36
	- in hospital	0	8	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	53	57	54
Arthritis	- in office	68	75	82
	- in hospital	0	10	6
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	29	13	12

School 02 continued

	N =	38	63	50
		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	24	10	10
	- in hospital	0	2	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	76	78
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	8	22	26
	- in hospital	3	11	6
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	84	57	62
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	21	24	36
	- in hospital	0	6	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	74	57	56
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	3	19	10
	- in hospital	0	5	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	92	67	76
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	53	63	56
	- in hospital	0	14	10
	- referred to others	3	6	2
	- no contact	42	14	32
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	18	33	26
	- in hospital	0	11	8
	- referred to others	3	0	4
	- no contact	68	44	58
Home-bound patient	- in office	8	17	12
	- in hospital	0	3	2
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	84	65	72
Nursing-home patient	- in office	42	49	36
	- in hospital	3	10	16
	- referred to others	3	0	4
	- no contact	50	37	44
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	39	40	28
	- in hospital	0	5	6
	- referred to others	3	3	2
	- no contact	53	44	54
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	5	11	10
	- in hospital	0	6	2
	- referred to others	3	2	2
	- no contact	84	63	76
Spina bifida	- in office	3	2	6
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	89	81	84
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	8	5	2
	- in hospital	0	0	0
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	87	81	86

School 02 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	38	63	50
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	89	84	90
	- in hospital	0	13	12
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	11	6	6
Hemophilia	- in office	3	13	8
	- in hospital	0	10	8
	- referred to others	3	6	2
	- no contact	89	60	72
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	76	79	84
	- in hospital	0	14	14
	- referred to others	5	0	0
	- no contact	21	11	10
Asthma	- in office	84	79	82
	- in hospital	0	10	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	13	10	12
Atherosclerosis	- in office	45	56	62
	- in hospital	0	10	6
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	47	27	30
Emphysema	- in office	50	51	44
	- in hospital	0	10	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	45	30	42
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	3	5	0
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	92	81	88
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	53	75	68
	- in hospital	0	8	8
	- referred to others	3	2	0
	- no contact	42	11	24
Autism	- in office	5	3	6
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	89	81	82
Hyperactivity	- in office	53	56	38
	- in hospital	0	5	0
	- referred to others	0	2	2
	- no contact	47	27	44
Other behavior problems	- in office	37	38	42
	- in hospital	0	6	8
	- referred to others	0	2	8
	- no contact	53	37	40
Leukemia	- in office	8	13	16
	- in hospital	0	10	4
	- referred to others	3	2	0
	- no contact	82	63	70

		N = 38	63	50
School 02 continued		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	18	14	14
	- in hospital	0	11	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	76	59	66
Brain tumors	- in office	13	16	18
	- in hospital	0	8	6
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	82	60	68
Sarcomas	- in office	13	11	10
	- in hospital	0	5	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	82	68	72
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	13	22	20
	- in hospital	0	13	10
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	79	56	62
Other neoplasms	- in office	29	37	36
	- in hospital	0	10	8
	- referred to others	3	0	2
	- no contact	63	43	52
Experience in school - Course work:				
	None at all	3	0	0
	Some mention in passing	37	0	0
	Perhaps one specific course	39	25	18
	Several specific courses	21	71	82
Experience in school - Clinical:				
	None at all	24	2	0
	Exposed to one or more	29	2	4
	Treated a handicapped patient	16	33	24
	Treated two or more	26	62	68
Would you say you have				
	Actively tried to treat handicapped?	3	14	12
	Treated handicapped when they appear?	89	79	84
	Generally avoided treating handicapped?	5	2	4
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
	Yes	37		
	Yes - became more interested		81	64
	Yes - became less interested		0	4
	No	58		
	No - was already interested		11	26
	No - remained uninterested		0	4
	Other		6	2

N =	38	63	50
School 02 continued	1974	1976	1978
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			16
No			62
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			6
Interior doors			6
Bathroom facilities			8
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			8
X-ray facilities			2
Other			0
Not in private practice			22
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			88
Incidental with one or more			10
Close working relations with one			2
Close working relations with two or more			0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			6
No			94
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			24
No			76
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			18
Have one or more short course or workshop?			2
Do informal reading and study?			2
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			12
A few consultations about selected patients			68
Frequent consultation about many patient			20

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		N = 29	37	78
School 03		1974	1976	1978
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		59	57	65
Professional partnership		14	8	8
Employed professional practice		3	11	12
Full-time residency or graduate training		7	8	0
Research and/or teaching		10	3	8
Military service		14	14	8
Other		0	5	15
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	55	81	73
	- in hospital	14	8	27
	- referred to others	7	11	8
	- no contact	28	11	8
Cerebral palsy	- in office	28	24	46
	- in hospital	10	5	15
	- referred to others	3	8	4
	- no contact	62	57	31
Blindness	- in office	28	30	35
	- in hospital	3	5	12
	- referred to others	3	0	0
	- no contact	66	62	42
Deafness	- in office	48	57	54
	- in hospital	3	5	12
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	48	38	31
Epilepsy	- in office	76	84	77
	- in hospital	10	11	23
	- referred to others	0	5	0
	- no contact	14	8	8
Stroke	- in office	38	38	42
	- in hospital	7	5	12
	- referred to others	0	3	4
	- no contact	55	46	31
Parkinsonism	- in office	31	14	38
	- in hospital	7	3	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	62	76	46
Arthritis	- in office	79	84	88
	- in hospital	7	8	12
	- referred to others	0	3	0
	- no contact	14	11	4

School 03 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	29	37	78
Poliomyelitis	- in office	24	14	31
	- in hospital	3	3	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	72	76	54
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	21	14	35
	- in hospital	3	8	15
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	72	70	46
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	10	14	35
	- in hospital	3	3	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	86	73	46
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	0	8	35
	- in hospital	0	3	8
	- referred to others	0	3	0
	- no contact	100	78	46
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	79	57	85
	- in hospital	17	16	19
	- referred to others	3	11	4
	- no contact	14	22	8
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	17	35	46
	- in hospital	14	8	15
	- referred to others	3	3	0
	- no contact	62	51	35
Home-bound patient	- in office	10	19	19
	- in hospital	3	3	8
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	83	65	54
Nursing-home patient	- in office	41	35	23
	- in hospital	3	5	8
	- referred to others	0	3	4
	- no contact	55	46	50
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	34	30	54
	- in hospital	10	14	15
	- referred to others	10	5	0
	- no contact	48	51	27
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	14	11	15
	- in hospital	7	5	8
	- referred to others	7	0	4
	- no contact	76	73	62
Spina bifida	- in office	3	8	0
	- in hospital	0	0	8
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	93	78	77
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	3	8
	- in hospital	0	0	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	100	86	65

School 03 continued

	N =	29	37	78
		1974	1976	1978
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	93	89	85
	- in hospital	14	8	23
	- referred to others	3	3	0
	- no contact	0	8	0
Hemophilia	- in office	17	22	12
	- in hospital	3	11	23
	- referred to others	7	3	12
	- no contact	72	57	46
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	90	86	65
	- in hospital	14	11	19
	- referred to others	7	11	8
	- no contact	0	8	8
Asthma	- in office	83	84	85
	- in hospital	10	8	19
	- referred to others	0	3	0
	- no contact	10	11	0
Atherosclerosis	- in office	52	51	58
	- in hospital	10	5	4
	- referred to others	7	3	0
	- no contact	41	35	23
Emphysema	- in office	62	62	58
	- in hospital	10	8	12
	- referred to others	3	3	0
	- no contact	31	30	23
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	3	3	4
	- in hospital	0	3	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	93	81	73
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	66	57	77
	- in hospital	10	5	15
	- referred to others	7	5	4
	- no contact	21	27	8
Autism	- in office	0	5	4
	- in hospital	0	3	12
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	97	81	65
Hyperactivity	- in office	52	43	62
	- in hospital	7	5	19
	- referred to others	3	3	0
	- no contact	38	38	23
Other behavior problems	- in office	45	35	62
	- in hospital	7	3	15
	- referred to others	0	3	0
	- no contact	28	46	12
Leukemia	- in office	28	19	19
	- in hospital	3	5	15
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	69	68	50

	N =	29	37	78
School 03 continued		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	28	19	19
	- in hospital	7	5	12
	- referred to others	3	3	4
	- no contact	59	59	50
Brain tumors	- in office	7	8	12
	- in hospital	3	5	12
	- referred to others	0	0	8
	- no contact	90	76	62
Sarcomas	- in office	3	5	19
	- in hospital	3	5	15
	- referred to others	7	0	0
	- no contact	86	78	50
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	17	22	23
	- in hospital	7	11	8
	- referred to others	10	0	4
	- no contact	66	65	42
Other neoplasms	- in office	17	27	38
	- in hospital	7	11	12
	- referred to others	10	5	0
	- no contact	62	57	35
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		0	0	0
Some mention in passing		59	41	8
Perhaps one specific course		31	49	73
Several specific courses		10	11	19
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		52	35	8
Exposed to one or more		10	24	15
Treated a handicapped patient		14	19	42
Treated two or more		14	11	35
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		3	11	27
Treated handicapped when they appear?		97	86	69
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		0	3	4
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		41		
Yes - became more interested			32	42
Yes - became less interested			3	4
No		59		
No - was already interested			30	35
No - remained uninterested			11	8
Other			24	8

School 03 continued

N =	29	37	78
	1974	1976	1978
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			31
No			50
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			23
Interior doors			19
Bathroom facilities			12
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			8
X-ray facilities			4
Other			4
Not in private practice			19
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			62
Incidental with one or more			31
Close working relations with one			0
Close working relations with two or more			8
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			4
No			96
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			8
No			92
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			31
No			69
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			12
Have one or more short course or workshop?			15
Do informal reading and study?			15
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			27
A few consultations about selected patients			46
Frequent consultation about many patient			27

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	56	67	60
School 04				
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		36	43	67
Professional partnership		12	15	8
Employed professional practice		20	13	12
Full-time residency or graduate training		4	6	5
Research and/or teaching		5	0	12
Military service		30	19	12
Other		2	9	7
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	50	57	62
	- in hospital	21	18	12
	- referred to others	2	2	3
	- no contact	32	30	20
Cerebral palsy	- in office	16	22	20
	- in hospital	12	9	8
	- referred to others	2	1	3
	- no contact	68	64	58
Blindness	- in office	21	25	32
	- in hospital	12	3	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	61	70	53
Deafness	- in office	32	34	52
	- in hospital	14	4	7
	- referred to others	0	1	2
	- no contact	50	58	37
Epilepsy	- in office	61	76	75
	- in hospital	14	9	13
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	25	16	12
Stroke	- in office	38	57	47
	- in hospital	21	9	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	39	34	37
Parkinsonism	- in office	20	13	27
	- in hospital	11	7	7
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	68	79	57
Arthritis	- in office	68	72	82
	- in hospital	14	10	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	20	21	10

School 04 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	56	67	60
Poliomyelitis	- in office	12	7	5
	- in hospital	4	1	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	79	85	75
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	12	19	17
	- in hospital	9	3	10
	- referred to	0	1	0
	- no contact	73	76	58
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	5	7	27
	- in hospital	11	4	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	77	87	53
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	9	6	13
	- in hospital	9	3	7
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	77	88	68
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	62	49	63
	- in hospital	25	15	15
	- referred to others	2	6	3
	- no contact	20	30	25
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	18	21	27
	- in hospital	11	9	12
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	67	53
Home-bound patient	- in office	5	15	13
	- in hospital	5	1	3
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	82	79	63
Nursing-home patient	- in office	16	31	23
	- in hospital	11	12	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	71	58	53
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	34	34	28
	- in hospital	11	12	8
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	52	58	52
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	12	3	13
	- in hospital	9	4	7
	- referred to others	2	0	0
	- no contact	70	90	70
Spina bifida	- in office	2	4	3
	- in hospital	2	0	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	86	91	82
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	5	0	3
	- in hospital	0	0	2
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	86	97	80

School 04 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	56	67	60
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	80	85	92
	- in hospital	23	15	13
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	11	6	7
Hemophilia	- in office	12	13	8
	- in hospital	12	10	8
	- referred to others	0	1	2
	- no contact	70	70	70
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	80	84	85
	- in hospital	23	16	15
	- referred to others	2	0	0
	- no contact	9	9	8
Asthma	- in office	77	78	90
	- in hospital	20	10	8
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	11	12	5
Atherosclerosis	- in office	43	40	78
	- in hospital	16	7	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	38	48	10
Emphysema	- in office	38	48	60
	- in hospital	20	6	8
	- referred to others	0	1	2
	- no contact	43	45	28
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	5	1	10
	- in hospital	4	0	3
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	84	96	77
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	66	70	67
	- in hospital	14	7	8
	- referred to others	4	0	2
	- no contact	18	22	22
Autism	- in office	2	7	8
	- in hospital	4	1	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	89	90	75
Hyperactivity	- in office	39	55	52
	- in hospital	12	6	8
	- referred to others	2	0	5
	- no contact	48	39	30
Other behavior problems	- in office	36	40	53
	- in hospital	16	6	10
	- referred to others	11	3	7
	- no contact	41	49	23
Leukemia	- in office	11	15	17
	- in hospital	11	9	12
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	75	75	63

296

School 04 continued

		N = 56	67	60
		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	21	13	18
	- in hospital	11	10	7
	- referred to others	2	1	3
	- no contact	61	70	63
Brain tumors	- in office	7	3	13
	- in hospital	5	3	8
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	80	90	63
Sarcomas	- in office	9	10	5
	- in hospital	5	4	3
	- referred to others	0	0	3
	- no contact	79	84	75
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	18	15	13
	- in hospital	16	10	10
	- referred to others	4	0	5
	- no contact	62	73	67
Other neoplasms	- in office	32	22	28
	- in hospital	16	9	13
	- referred to others	4	0	7
	- no contact	46	67	48
Experience in school Course work:				
None at all		0	0	2
Some mention in passing		0	0	3
Perhaps one specific course		38	42	15
Several specific courses		62	57	80
Experience in school Clinical:				
None at all		0	0	0
Exposed to one or more		0	0	0
Treated a handicapped patient		2	6	3
Treated two or more		98	94	97
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		7	12	15
Treated handicapped when they appear?		89	85	85
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		4	1	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		62		
Yes - became more interested			61	78
Yes - became less interested			3	0
No		36		
No - was already interested			15	17
No - remained uninterested			3	3
Other			13	2

School 04 continued	1974	1976	1978
N =	56	67	60
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			28
No			55
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			18
Interior doors			20
Bathroom facilities			8
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			7
X-ray facilities			2
Other			5
Not in private practice			18
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			68
Incidental with one or more			22
Close working relations with one			2
Close working relations with two or more			3
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			3
No			95
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			10
No			90
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			23
No			77
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			15
Have one or more short course or workshop?			3
Do informal reading and study?			8
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			22
A few consultations about selected patients			70
Frequent consultation about many patient			8

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

School 05		1974	1976	1978
	N =	73	84	71
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		52	61	42
Professional partnership		21	11	13
Employed professional practice		15	8	27
Full-time residency or graduate training		3	4	7
Research and/or teaching		1	2	6
Military service		8	5	11
Other		4	12	11
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	60	81	61
	- in hospital	3	6	1
	- referred to others	5	8	1
	- no contact	27	14	32
Cerebral palsy	- in office	16	37	24
	- in hospital	1	5	4
	- referred to others	4	2	1
	- no contact	70	54	65
Blindness	- in office	21	43	18
	- in hospital	1	2	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	54	73
Deafness	- in office	41	57	49
	- in hospital	1	1	3
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	49	38	44
Epilepsy	- in office	71	83	70
	- in hospital	1	4	4
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	22	14	23
Stroke	- in office	40	61	46
	- in hospital	4	5	6
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	52	32	45
Parkinsonism	- in office	15	40	34
	- in hospital	1	5	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	74	54	59
Arthritis	- in office	71	87	76
	- in hospital	3	4	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	22	11	17

School 05 continued

	N =	73	84	71
		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	11	23	17
	- in hospital	0	0	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	73	76
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	25	19	24
	- in hospital	1	4	0
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	73	69
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	22	24	28
	- in hospital	4	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	70	66
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	10	11	13
	- in hospital	3	1	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	78	82	79
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	63	79	63
	- in hospital	8	7	7
	- referred to others	0	1	1
	- no contact	29	13	25
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	22	32	18
	- in hospital	4	5	3
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	63	57	72
Home-bound patient	- in office	10	18	17
	- in hospital	4	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	78	75	75
Nursing-home patient	- in office	36	42	38
	- in hospital	4	10	4
	- referred to others	1	0	3
	- no contact	53	46	51
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	34	63	31
	- in hospital	4	2	3
	- referred to others	7	0	0
	- no contact	52	33	59
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	11	21	14
	- in hospital	3	2	1
	- referred to others	3	4	0
	- no contact	73	68	79
Spina bifida	- in office	5	10	1
	- in hospital	1	1	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	85	85	92
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	0	4
	- in hospital	1	1	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	90	92	86

School 05 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	73	84	71
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	86	95	86
	- in hospital	3	4	6
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	7	5	10
Hemophilia	- in office	8	21	18
	- in hospital	4	1	6
	- referred to others	7	6	0
	- no contact	71	68	70
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	74	79	79
	- in hospital	4	6	4
	- referred to others	8	1	0
	- no contact	12	17	17
Asthma	- in office	84	89	83
	- in hospital	3	4	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	11	10	10
Atherosclerosis	- in office	52	64	66
	- in hospital	3	4	0
	- referred to others	1	1	0
	- no contact	40	31	24
Emphysema	- in office	52	67	63
	- in hospital	3	4	3
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	40	27	30
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	3	5	7
	- in hospital	1	0	0
	- referred to others	1	0	0
	- no contact	86	90	83
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	73	68	66
	- in hospital	5	6	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	18	30	27
Autism	- in office	0	11	4
	- in hospital	1	2	0
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	86	80	86
Hyperactivity	- in office	53	67	49
	- in hospital	1	4	1
	- referred to others	5	4	1
	- no contact	38	24	44
Other behavior problems	- in office	49	54	54
	- in hospital	3	2	4
	- referred to others	5	5	3
	- no contact	34	31	34
Leukemia	- in office	8	15	18
	- in hospital	5	1	4
	- referred to others	1	1	0
	- no contact	79	80	69

	N =	73	84	71
School 05 continued		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	21	24	37
	- in hospital	4	2	0
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	67	64	55
Brain tumors	- in office	14	18	13
	- in hospital	0	1	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	77	79
Sarcomas	- in office	7	6	11
	- in hospital	1	0	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	84	88	79
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	26	26	20
	- in hospital	5	2	3
	- referred to others	1	0	3
	- no contact	63	67	69
Other neoplasms	- in office	23	40	37
	- in hospital	5	5	3
	- referred to others	1	4	3
	- no contact	63	49	52
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		1	0	0
Some mention in passing		51	6	8
Perhaps one specific course		30	38	49
Several specific courses		15	50	41
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		18	4	0
Exposed to one or more		30	6	6
Treated a handicapped patient		27	14	14
Treated two or more		22	75	80
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		1	8	8
Treated handicapped when they appear?		93	89	85
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		3	0	3
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		37		
Yes - became more interested			60	72
Yes - became less interested			1	3
No		60		
No - was already interested			20	15
No - remained uninterested			2	1
Other			12	6

School 05 continued	N = 73 1974	84 1976	71 1978
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			24
No			55
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			17
Interior doors			14
Bathroom facilities			18
Provided special equipment			4
Operatory			1
X-ray facilities			0
Other			1
Not in private practice			21
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			80
Incidental with one or more			20
Close working relations with one			0
Close working relations with two or more			0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			1
No			99
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			8
No			90
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			1
Have one or more short course or workshop?			4
Do informal reading and study?			2
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			41
A few consultations about selected patients			56
Frequent consultation about many patient			1

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		N = 47	24	89
School 06		1974	1976	1978
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		30	54	60
Professional partnership		23	4	18
Employed professional practice		17	21	17
Full-time residency or graduate training		4	4	2
Research and/or teaching		2	0	2
Military service		11	4	6
Other		17	12	2
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	66	62	71
	- in hospital	17	12	7
	- referred to others	2	4	2
	- no contact	21	25	22
Cerebral palsy	- in office	19	25	37
	- in hospital	9	8	6
	- referred to others	0	8	0
	- no contact	70	62	54
Blindness	- in office	17	46	33
	- in hospital	2	8	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	74	50	63
Deafness	- in office	45	58	56
	- in hospital	2	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	47	38	38
Epilepsy	- in office	66	83	79
	- in hospital	13	8	3
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	21	12	18
Stroke	- in office	38	58	60
	- in hospital	6	8	6
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	55	33	37
Parkinsonism	- in office	32	46	33
	- in hospital	6	8	2
	- referred to others	0	4	0
	- no contact	60	42	60
Arthritis	- in office	79	83	85
	- in hospital	4	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	13	12	10

School 06 continued

		N = 47	N = 24	N = 89
		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	19	12	17
	- in hospital	2	8	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	72	79	76
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	19	17	31
	- in hospital	4	8	4
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	72	75	63
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	26	25	37
	- in hospital	6	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	64	67	58
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	2	17	16
	- in hospital	0	8	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	91	75	78
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	64	62	74
	- in hospital	17	12	6
	- referred to others	2	0	1
	- no contact	28	29	20
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	21	25	38
	- in hospital	11	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	64	71	54
Home-bound patient	- in office	6	25	20
	- in hospital	4	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	71	71
Nursing-home patient	- in office	49	38	56
	- in hospital	6	12	18
	- referred to others	0	4	0
	- no contact	43	50	31
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	38	62	44
	- in hospital	6	8	3
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	53	33	51
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	6	12	11
	- in hospital	0	8	1
	- referred to others	2	0	1
	- no contact	83	79	81
Spina bifida	- in office	0	0	2
	- in hospital	0	4	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	91	96	91
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	2	0	3
	- in hospital	2	4	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	89	92	91

School 06 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	47	24	89
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	83	96	91
	- in hospital	13	8	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	6	0	6
Hemophilia	- in office	21	8	17
	- in hospital	9	12	3
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	68	79	75
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	81	79	84
	- in hospital	13	8	8
	- referred to others	2	4	2
	- no contact	9	12	11
Asthma	- in office	77	83	88
	- in hospital	6	8	6
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	15	12	9
Atherosclerosis	- in office	43	50	56
	- in hospital	6	8	7
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	49	42	37
Emphysema	- in office	57	67	72
	- in hospital	6	8	6
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	34	29	24
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	2	4	7
	- in hospital	2	8	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	91	88	88
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	70	50	72
	- in hospital	9	8	7
	- referred to others	2	0	4
	- no contact	21	46	26
Autism	- in office	6	0	8
	- in hospital	0	0	1
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	87	96	85
Hyperactivity	- in office	43	50	60
	- in hospital	4	8	3
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	43	42	36
Other behavior problems	- in office	51	21	65
	- in hospital	6	4	6
	- referred to others	6	0	10
	- no contact	36	67	27
Leukemia	- in office	15	8	19
	- in hospital	6	4	6
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	77	88	73

School 06 continued		N = 47 1974	24 1976	89 1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	19	21	26
	- in hospital	9	8	4
	- referred to others	2	0	2
	- no contact	68	71	64
Brain tumors	- in office	17	17	24
	- in hospital	2	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	74	79	70
Sarcomas	- in office	11	12	13
	- in hospital	0	8	3
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	83	79	79
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	19	8	19
	- in hospital	6	8	6
	- referred to others	0	4	4
	- no contact	70	79	71
Other neoplasms	- in office	26	17	27
	- in hospital	6	4	6
	- referred to others	2	4	1
	- no contact	68	75	64
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		9	0	0
Some mention in passing		53	54	7
Perhaps one specific course		28	25	55
Several specific courses		9	21	38
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		13	17	13
Exposed to one or more		17	21	18
Treated a handicapped patient		26	25	21
Treated two or more		40	38	47
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		11	17	11
Treated handicapped when they appear?		87	79	85
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		2	4	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		45		
Yes - became more interested			21	47
Yes - became less interested			8	6
No		51		
No - was already interested			50	33
No - remained uninterested			8	8
Other			8	4

N =	47	24	89
School 06 continued	1974	1976	1978
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			26
No			62
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			16
Interior doors			15
Bathroom facilities			17
Provided special equipment			2
Operatory			8
X-ray facilities			3
Other			6
Not in private practice			11
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			72
Incidental with one or more			24
Close working relations with one			2
Close working relations with two or more			2
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			2
No			98
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			21
No			78
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			7
Have one or more short course or workshop?			6
Do informal reading and study?			13
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			26
A few consultations about selected patients			69
Frequent consultation about many patient			6

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	29	10	40
School 07				
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		66	40	58
Professional partnership		21	0	25
Employed professional practice		14	0	5
Full-time residency or graduate training		0	0	2
Research and/or teaching		0	10	5
Military service		7	40	10
Other		7	20	2
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	69	50	72
	- in hospital	3	20	22
	- referred to others	7	0	0
	- no contact	24	20	18
Cerebral palsy	- in office	38	40	40
	- in hospital	0	30	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	55	30	48
Blindness	- in office	28	20	30
	- in hospital	3	0	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	62	60	58
Deafness	- in office	34	10	40
	- in hospital	3	0	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	59	60	45
Epilepsy	- in office	69	60	72
	- in hospital	3	0	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	17	20	20
Stroke	- in office	45	40	58
	- in hospital	7	20	8
	- referred to others	3	0	0
	- no contact	41	30	35
Parkinsonism	- in office	21	20	38
	- in hospital	0	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	69	60	55
Arthritis	- in office	83	30	82
	- in hospital	0	10	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	14	40	15

School 07 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	29	10	40
Poliomyelitis	- in office	28	10	15
	- in hospital	0	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	70	72
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	7	20	25
	- in hospital	3	10	8
	- referred to	0	0	0
	- no contact	83	50	68
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	21	20	32
	- in hospital	7	0	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	66	60	60
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	7	20	22
	- in hospital	3	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	83	60	65
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	62	40	62
	- in hospital	10	10	10
	- referred to others	3	10	0
	- no contact	21	30	32
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	24	30	40
	- in hospital	3	20	10
	- referred to others	3	0	0
	- no contact	66	40	48
Home-bound patient	- in office	14	20	25
	- in hospital	3	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	69	60	62
Nursing-home patient	- in office	52	30	62
	- in hospital	14	10	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	31	50	28
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	31	30	42
	- in hospital	3	20	5
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	66	30	55
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	10	10	15
	- in hospital	0	0	15
	- referred to others	3	0	0
	- no contact	76	70	70
Spina bifida	- in office	0	10	10
	- in hospital	3	10	5
	- referred to others	3	0	0
	- no contact	90	60	80
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	0	2
	- in hospital	0	0	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	90	80	85

School 07 continued

	N =	29	10	40
		1974	1976	1978
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	97	60	88
	- in hospital	7	10	10
	- referred to others	0	0	5
	- no contact	3	10	2
Hemophilia	- in office	21	10	15
	- in hospital	3	10	8
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	66	60	62
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	76	60	88
	- in hospital	10	10	10
	- referred to others	10	0	5
	- no contact	7	10	5
Asthma	- in office	72	60	88
	- in hospital	3	10	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	21	0	5
Atherosclerosis	- in office	28	50	60
	- in hospital	3	10	10
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	59	20	25
Emphysema	- in office	59	40	52
	- in hospital	3	10	5
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	31	30	38
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	7	0	22
	- in hospital	0	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	83	80	62
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	76	60	52
	- in hospital	3	10	8
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	21	20	32
Autism	- in office	0	0	2
	- in hospital	0	10	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	86	70	82
Hyperactivity	- in office	59	20	42
	- in hospital	3	10	5
	- referred to others	3	0	5
	- no contact	31	50	42
Other behavior problems	- in office	34	40	40
	- in hospital	3	10	12
	- referred to others	7	0	8
	- no contact	52	40	40
Leukemia	- in office	17	10	15
	- in hospital	3	10	8
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	72	60	70

	N =	29	10	40
School 07 continued		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	21	20	15
	- in hospital	0	10	8
	- referred to others	3	0	2
	- no contact	66	50	62
Brain tumors	- in office	10	10	15
	- in hospital	0	0	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	79	70	72
Sarcomas	- in office	7	10	18
	- in hospital	0	10	2
	- referred to others	3	0	2
	- no contact	79	60	68
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	7	10	30
	- in hospital	3	10	5
	- referred to others	3	10	2
	- no contact	79	50	60
Other neoplasms	- in office	28	30	32
	- in hospital	0	10	5
	- referred to others	10	0	2
	- no contact	55	40	58
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		3	0	0
Some mention in passing		86	20	20
Perhaps one specific course		7	40	45
Several specific courses		3	40	35
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		45	0	0
Exposed to one or more		34	10	2
Treated a handicapped patient		3	0	12
Treated two or more		14	90	85
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		7	20	12
Treated handicapped when they appear?		86	70	82
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		7	0	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		10		
Yes - became more interested			70	48
Yes - became less interested			0	0
No		86		
No - was already interested			20	35
No - remained uninterested			0	5
Other			0	10

School 07 continued

	1974	1976	1978
N =	29	10	40
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			20
No			70
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			18
Interior doors			12
Bathroom facilities			8
Provided special equipment			0
Operatory			2
X-ray facilities			5
Other			0
Not in private practice			10
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			75
Incidental with one or more			22
Close working relations with one			2
Close working relations with two or more			0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			12
No			88
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			12
No			82
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			12
Have one or more short course or workshop?			2
Do informal reading and study?			5
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			20
A few consultations about selected patients			62
Frequent consultation about many patient			15

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

		N = 69	90	79
School 10		1974	1976	1978
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		74	66	75
Professional partnership		6	2	5
Employed professional practice		6	6	3
Full-time residency or graduate training		0	7	4
Research and/or teaching		1	2	1
Military service		9	4	5
Other		6	13	10
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	58	73	72
	- in hospital	9	9	4
	- referred to others	3	6	8
	- no contact	29	12	18
Cerebral palsy	- in office	19	32	43
	- in hospital	7	4	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	61	53	47
Blindness	- in office	30	34	46
	- in hospital	1	4	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	59	50	48
Deafness	- in office	48	59	58
	- in hospital	6	3	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	39	31	33
Epilepsy	- in office	80	76	80
	- in hospital	6	7	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	12	13	14
Stroke	- in office	54	54	65
	- in hospital	7	4	4
	- referred to others	1	0	1
	- no contact	29	33	25
Parkinsonism	- in office	20	29	35
	- in hospital	3	1	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	67	56	54
Arthritis	- in office	84	80	87
	- in hospital	6	8	4
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	7	9	6

School 10 continued	N =	69	90	79
		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	22	20	19
	- in hospital	1	0	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	68	64	71
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	22	20	20
	- in hospital	4	7	5
	- referred to	0	0	1
	- no contact	67	62	67
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	16	14	23
	- in hospital	4	1	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	70	67	67
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	9	13	11
	- in hospital	3	0	3
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	80	69	76
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	57	70	71
	- in hospital	10	10	6
	- referred to others	4	2	8
	- no contact	28	18	20
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	33	31	44
	- in hospital	6	7	4
	- referred to others	3	0	5
	- no contact	52	51	48
Home-bound patient	- in office	14	19	23
	- in hospital	6	4	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	70	63	61
Nursing-home patient	- in office	32	34	43
	- in hospital	16	4	10
	- referred to others	1	1	3
	- no contact	43	48	44
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	35	34	27
	- in hospital	4	4	1
	- referred to others	1	3	5
	- no contact	58	49	62
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	14	17	15
	- in hospital	1	3	3
	- referred to others	0	0	4
	- no contact	75	68	70
Spina bifida	- in office	3	10	8
	- in hospital	3	1	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	86	76	80
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	4	2	1
	- in hospital	0	0	0
	- referred to others	0	1	0
	- no contact	83	80	87

School 10 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =	69	90	79
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	90	86	92
	- in hospital	6	9	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	3	3	4
Hemophilia	- in office	17	18	20
	- in hospital	4	3	4
	- referred to others	4	7	6
	- no contact	65	61	63
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	75	74	89
	- in hospital	7	8	8
	- referred to others	4	1	3
	- no contact	13	13	5
Asthma	- in office	81	77	86
	- in hospital	6	8	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	12	11	9
Atherosclerosis	- in office	49	59	73
	- in hospital	6	4	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	38	26	18
Emphysema	- in office	62	58	73
	- in hospital	6	4	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	28	27	22
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	4	7	6
	- in hospital	1	2	1
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	84	73	82
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	61	63	73
	- in hospital	7	3	5
	- referred to others	3	6	6
	- no contact	28	18	16
Autism	- in office	6	7	4
	- in hospital	1	1	1
	- referred to others	0	0	1
	- no contact	84	74	84
Hyperactivity	- in office	43	56	49
	- in hospital	1	4	4
	- referred to others	0	3	3
	- no contact	48	30	39
Other behavior problems	- in office	36	38	46
	- in hospital	7	4	3
	- referred to others	4	1	5
	- no contact	42	41	37
Leukemia	- in office	12	11	22
	- in hospital	4	4	4
	- referred to others	1	1	0
	- no contact	74	71	70

316

School 10 continued

		N = 69	90	79
		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	25	16	24
	- in hospital	4	4	4
	- referred to others	3	1	1
	- no contact	61	64	65
Brain tumors	- in office	12	11	15
	- in hospital	4	3	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	75	70	73
Sarcomas	- in office	12	10	9
	- in hospital	3	2	4
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	75	73	77
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	16	20	23
	- in hospital	4	3	6
	- referred to others	4	1	5
	- no contact	70	64	61
Other neoplasms	- in office	28	28	35
	- in hospital	4	2	5
	- referred to others	1	0	4
	- no contact	59	54	53
Experience in school - Course work:				
None at all		3	0	0
Some mention in passing		17	3	4
Perhaps one specific course		61	52	63
Several specific courses		19	43	33
Experience in school - Clinical:				
None at all		7	0	1
Exposed to one or more		9	7	8
Treated a handicapped patient		28	34	34
Treated two or more		54	59	57
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		4	14	13
Treated handicapped when they appear?		94	82	87
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		1	1	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		43		
Yes - became more interested			69	41
Yes - became less interested			0	4
No		57		
No - was already interested			18	42
No - remained uninterested			3	8
Other			9	5

School 10 continued

	1974	1976	1978
N =	69	90	79
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			24
No			61
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			20
Interior doors			11
Bathroom facilities			8
Provided special equipment			1
Operatory			5
X-ray facilities			0
Other			3
Not in private practice			15
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			68
Incidental with one or more			19
Close working relations with one			8
Close working relations with two or more			4
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			9
No			90
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			11
No			87
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			5
Have one or more short course or workshop?			4
Do informal reading and study?			6
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			15
A few consultations about selected patients			76
Frequent consultation about many patient			9

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS BY YEAR

(In Percents)

	N =	26	49	44
School 11		1974	1976	1978
How would you describe your current practice?				
Self-employed professional practice		62	53	73
Professional partnership		15	2	9
Employed professional practice		4	8	11
Full-time residency or graduate training		0	4	7
Research and/or teaching		8	4	5
Military service		19	31	2
Other		4	4	5
Have treated the following				
Mental Retardation	- in office	50	59	64
	- in hospital	15	16	16
	- referred to others	4	2	0
	- no contact	31	29	23
Cerebral palsy	- in office	19	16	25
	- in hospital	0	12	14
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	69	65	57
Blindness	- in office	31	29	43
	- in hospital	12	10	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	54	55	39
Deafness	- in office	42	16	61
	- in hospital	8	4	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	46	71	20
Epilepsy	- in office	77	71	82
	- in hospital	8	16	7
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	15	20	9
Stroke	- in office	54	43	48
	- in hospital	0	8	11
	- referred to others	4	2	0
	- no contact	46	43	43
Parkinsonism	- in office	19	33	14
	- in hospital	0	2	11
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	69	55	64
Arthritis	- in office	81	84	84
	- in hospital	8	6	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	8	12	11

		N =	49	44
School 11 continued		1974	1976	1978
Poliomyelitis	- in office	27	16	16
	- in hospital	0	4	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	65	69	70
Spinal cord injuries	- in office	27	18	25
	- in hospital	4	4	11
	- referred to	0	2	0
	- no contact	62	67	57
Multiple sclerosis	- in office	27	16	27
	- in hospital	0	8	14
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	65	69	55
Muscular dystrophy	- in office	12	10	2
	- in hospital	0	2	5
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	81	78	75
Facial trauma from accidents	- in office	69	63	64
	- in hospital	19	18	18
	- referred to others	4	4	0
	- no contact	23	22	27
Multiply-handicapped	- in office	19	27	20
	- in hospital	0	10	14
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	73	63	59
Home-bound patient	- in office	12	4	7
	- in hospital	0	0	2
	- referred to others	0	2	2
	- no contact	77	84	75
Nursing-home patient	- in office	50	24	32
	- in hospital	8	6	23
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	42	61	50
Cleft palate/cleft lip	- in office	42	43	16
	- in hospital	8	4	9
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	50	45	66
Other craniofacial anomalies	- in office	8	18	5
	- in hospital	4	6	7
	- referred to others	4	2	0
	- no contact	77	67	80
Spina bifida	- in office	4	4	0
	- in hospital	4	4	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	85	82	86
Thalidomide deformities/ similar malformations	- in office	0	0	5
	- in hospital	0	2	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	92	88	80

School 11 continued

		1974	1976	1978
	N =		49	44
Diabetes/other endocrine disturbances	- in office	92	96	89
	- in hospital	15	14	9
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	0	2	9
Hemophilia	- in office	15	18	16
	- in hospital	12	14	14
	- referred to others	4	4	7
	- no contact	65	59	55
Cardiopulmonary disease	- in office	73	76	82
	- in hospital	15	16	16
	- referred to others	4	0	2
	- no contact	15	16	5
Asthma	- in office	92	86	73
	- in hospital	15	10	9
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	4	10	16
Atherosclerosis	- in office	62	41	50
	- in hospital	0	10	7
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	35	51	39
Emphysema	- in office	58	39	52
	- in hospital	8	12	11
	- referred to others	0	0	2
	- no contact	35	47	32
Cystic fibrosis	- in office	4	4	5
	- in hospital	0	0	0
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	88	86	82
Allergic reactions to drugs used in dental treatment	- in office	85	61	66
	- in hospital	12	12	11
	- referred to others	0	4	2
	- no contact	8	22	23
Autism	- in office	0	4	9
	- in hospital	0	2	2
	- referred to others	0	0	0
	- no contact	88	88	75
Hyperactivity	- in office	62	43	43
	- in hospital	4	8	7
	- referred to others	4	0	2
	- no contact	31	45	43
Other behavior problems	- in office	54	33	45
	- in hospital	4	8	9
	- referred to others	4	4	2
	- no contact	27	53	30
Leukemia	- in office	12	18	16
	- in hospital	0	10	11
	- referred to others	4	0	0
	- no contact	81	65	61

School 11 continued		N =	49	44
		1974	1976	1978
Other blood dyscrasias	- in office	12	18	16
	- in hospital	4	6	11
	- referred to others	0	2	0
	- no contact	77	61	61
Brain tumors	- in office	15	12	16
	- in hospital	0	4	0
	- referred to others	4	0	2
	- no contact	77	73	70
Sarcomas	- in office	15	12	7
	- in hospital	0	4	2
	- referred to others	4	2	2
	- no contact	73	73	75
Squamous cell carcinoma	- in office	27	31	11
	- in hospital	15	10	11
	- referred to others	8	0	2
	- no contact	46	51	66
Other neoplasms	- in office	35	33	25
	- in hospital	8	12	11
	- referred to others	4	0	2
	- no contact	54	47	50
Experience in school Course work:				
None at all		0	0	0
Some mention in passing		54	4	2
Perhaps one specific course		23	41	14
Several specific courses		23	55	84
Experience in school Clinical:				
None at all		15	0	2
Exposed to one or more		8	2	2
Treated a handicapped patient		19	31	7
Treated two or more		58	67	89
Would you say you have				
Actively tried to treat handicapped?		0	8	16
Treated handicapped when they appear?		100	88	82
Generally avoided treating handicapped?		0	0	0
Was your attitude toward treating handicapped changed by school experiences?				
Yes		42		
Yes - became more interested			69	61
Yes - became less interested			2	2
No		58		
No - was already interested			12	23
No - remained uninterested			0	11
Other			16	2

School 11 continued	1974	1976	1978
N =		49	44
Have you made any modifications to your office for handicapped?			
Yes			36
No			57
Modifications:			
Outside entrance			20
Interior doors			20
Bathroom facilities			30
Provided special equipment			2
Operatory			5
X-ray facilities			5
Other			5
Not in private practice			7
What contacts have you had with organizations for the handicapped in your practice?			
None			86
Incidental with one or more			14
Close working relations with one			0
Close working relations with two or more			0
Have you joined the Academy of Dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			0
No			100
Have you been a consultant to any group representing the handicapped?			
Yes			7
No			93
Since completing dental school, have you had any additional education on dentistry for the handicapped?			
Yes			23
No			77
If yes, did you			
Have full time residency or graduate enrollment?			5
Have one or more short course or workshop?			9
Do informal reading and study?			14
What consultations have you had with medical experts concerning handicapped patients?			
None			14
A few consultations about selected patients			80
Frequent consultation about many patient			5